DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 154 508 EA 010 608

AUTHOR Byrne, David R.; And Others
TITLE The Senior High School Principalship. Volume I: The National Survey.
INSTITUTION National Association of Secondary School Principals, Reston, Va.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 96p.; Appendix may not reproduce clearly due to small print
AVAILABLE FROM National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1904 Association Drive, Reston, Virginia 22091 ($3.00, quantity discounts; orders totaling $10 or less must be accompanied by payment; shipping charges plus a $2 handling fee are added to all orders that are billed)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Activities; Background; Demography; Futures (of Society); *National Surveys; *Occupational Information; *Principals; *Role Perception; School Community Relationship; *Senior High Schools; Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

A national study was made in 1977 to update the assessment of the principalship and to describe the characteristics, conditions, and perceptions of senior high school principals and of significant other persons involved with schools. This report provides a baseline of "normative-descriptive" information about principals, their views, and working conditions. Data collected from a random sample of senior high school principals included school characteristics; current status of programs and personnel; job tasks; professional background; professional activities; constraints and issues; work with the community; involvement of parents and community agencies; perceptions and opinions about priorities and tasks, rewards, and status; and perceptions of education's future. The survey was correlated with a study completed and published by the National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1965. The results of that study are referred to in this publication where appropriate. (Author/MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED154508

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Senior High School Principalship

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NASSP

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Volume I: The National Survey

David R. Byrne
Susan A. Hines
Lloyd E. McCleary

National Association of Secondary School Principals
1904 Association Drive • Reston, Virginia 22091

EA 010 608

About the Authors

David R. Byrne is associate professor and assistant dean, Graduate School of Education, University of Utah; Susan A. Hines is assistant professor, Graduate School of Education, University of Utah; and Lloyd E. McCleary is professor of educational administration, Graduate School of Education, University of Utah.

ISBN 0-88210-091-2

Copyright 1978
All Rights Reserved
National Association of Secondary School Principals
1904 Association Drive, Reston, Va. 22091

Contents

Foreword vii

Introduction ix

1. Personal - Professional Characteristics of the High School Principal Today 1

2. Job Tasks and Problems 19

3. School, Program, and Personnel Factors 32

4. Educational Purposes and Practices 45

5. Parent and Community Relationships 52

6. The High School Principal and the Future 57

Appendix 65

Steering Committee
for the
Study of the Senior High School Principalship

Lloyd E. McCleary
Richard A. Gorton
Judith S. Greene
Brother Eagan Hunter
Henry L. Miller
Eugene R. Smoley
Scott D. Thomson, *Chairman*

Research Team for the Study

Lloyd E. McCleary, *Chairman*
Richard A. Gorton
Kenneth E. McIntyre
David R. Byrne
Scott D. Thomson

Supported by the Rockefeller Family Fund

Tables

1 Distribution of Principals by Sex 1
2 Distribution of Principals by Age 2
3 Ethnic Distribution of Principals 2
4 Formal Education Completed 3
5 Distribution of Undergraduate Majors 3
6 Graduate Study 3
7 Age at Initial Appointment 4
8 Years in the Principalship 4
9 Number of Principalships 5
10 Years as Principal in Current School 5
11 Professional Activities 6
12 Principals' Career Aspirations 7
13 Would You Make the Same Career Choice? 8
14 Utility of Preparation Course Work 9
15 Most Essential Courses 10
16 Professional Periodicals 11
17 National "Reform" Reports on Secondary Education 12
18 Sex by Region 13
19 Sex Ratio in Population Categories 14
20 Sex by School Type 14
21 Region by Age 15
22 Age by School Size 15
23 Population by Principal's Age 16
24 Region by Ethnicity 17
25 Ethnicity by Population 17
26 Average Work Week of Principals 20
27 Allocation of Time for a Typical Work Week 20
28 Teaching Responsibility of Principals 21
29 Administrative Assistants to the Principal 21
30 Student Enrollment and Administrative Assistants to the Principal 22
31 Principals' Ratings of Job Characteristics 23
32 Scope of Authority of Principals in Certain Decision Functions 24
33 Administrative Roadblocks 25
34 Extent of Influence of Interest Groups on the School 26
35 Salary 27
36 A Comparison of Salary by Age 28

37 A Comparison of Salaries by Age 28
38 A Comparison of Salary by Ethnicity 28
39 A Comparison of Salaries by Regions 29
40 A Comparison of Salaries by Sex 29
41 A Comparison of Salaries by School Enrollment 30
42 Basis for Determination of Salary 30
43 School Size by Region 33
44 School Size by Type 34
45 Location of High Schools by Region According to Type 35
46 School Size: The Very Small and the Very Large by Region 36
47 School Size: The Very Small and the Very Large, By Type 37
48 Distribution of Grade Levels in High Schools 38
49 Expenditures per Student in Percent of Schools 39
50 Percent of High Schools by Region and Expenditure per Student 39
51 Average Daily Attendance by Percent of High Schools 40
52 Dropout Rate by Percentage of High Schools 41
53 Percentage of Last Graduating Class Entering College 41
54 Male/Female Ratios by Percent of High Schools 42
55 Educational Levels of Teachers Employed Last Five Years by Percent of High Schools 42
56 New Full-Time Teachers Exclusive of Transfers by Percent of High Schools 43
57 Ranking of Educational Tasks 45
58 Principals' Beliefs about Broad Educational Issues 46
59 Responses to "Do you favor a multiple diploma?" by Percent of Principals 48
60 Responses to "Do you favor individual promotion?" by Percent of Principals Responding 49
61 Responses of Principals to Question of Technological Advances as Promise of Improving Quality of Education 49
62 Responses to Opinion of Checks on Basic Skills 49
63 Responses about Optimum Size for a Comprehensive High School 50
64 Types of Experience for which Students Earn Graduation Credit 51
65 State and Federally Funded Programs by Percent of Schools 51
66 Community Types and High School Principalships 52
67 Principals' Opinions of Willingness of Parents and Students To Participate in School 53
68 Areas of Involvement of Parents or Citizens in the School 53
69 Constraints of the Principal in Fulfilling Responsibilities of his Job 55
70 Percentage of Enrollment Participating in Programs 56
71 Factors External to Schools 57
72 Influence of Desegregation by Region 58
73 Influence of Special Interest Factors 59
74 Influence of School Factors 60

Foreword

MOST EVERYONE AGREES that the principal is the key to a good school. Yet little data have been collected on the senior high school principalship since 1965 when NASSP conducted and published its last national study.

The nature of the principalship surely has changed during the past decade in response to the many modifications coming to high schools during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Certainly the emergence of professional negotiations, of court decisions on student affairs and on desegregation, and the constantly shifting priorities of the public for schools presaged a different principalship in the late 1970s than existed in the mid 1960s.

Considering these circumstances and the importance of the position, NASSP decided that high priority must be given to a 1977 national study of the principalship so that the current nature of the assignment as well as the background and training of principals could be determined. Consequently, a steering committee was formed under the chairmanship of Deputy Executive Director Scott Thomson to launch the study.

Supporting funds were pledged by the Rockefeller Family Fund and the research team went to work. The steering committee and research team agreed that the study should consist of three parts: a random sample survey of 1,600 principals, an in-depth interview with 60 "effective" principals, and a look at future forces and conditions acting upon the principalship. This publication, Volume I, reports and analyzes the data from the random sample survey.

The study could not have been completed without the cooperation of almost 1,200 busy high school principals. We express our appreciation to them for taking time from their 55- or 60-hour work weeks to respond to the questionnaire. A special note of thanks goes to the steering committee, to Lloyd McCleary as leader of the research team, and to David Byrne, the statistician for the normative survey. They all made significant contributions of time and talent.

We believe this 1977 survey of the high school principalship to be an important and useful study. It documents the dramatic changes that have occurred in the position since 1965 and suggests some initiatives that must be taken on behalf of principals, their schools, and their students.

Owen B. Kiernan
Executive Director
NASSP

Introduction

HIGH SCHOOLS ARE a significant and vital part of American life. In fact, interest in their character, condition, and progress is so intense that the principalship as a position and the principal as a person are in the spotlight. Few communities, indeed, absolve their schools from analysis and debate.

By the late 1970s, a decade of turbulence for high schools with the principal often as a central figure subsided. The time was ripe for a comprehensive, reliable assessment of the principalship and of the status of principals. The National Association of Secondary School Principals with support from the Rockefeller Family Fund undertook a major national study in 1977 to update the picture and to describe the characteristics, conditions, and perceptions of senior high school principals and of significant other persons involved with schools.

This report, Volume I, analyzes the data collected from a random sample of senior high school principals nationwide. Among the factors included in the study were: school characteristics; current status of programs and personnel; job tasks; professional background; professional activities; constraints and issues; work with the community; involvement of parents and community agencies; perceptions and opinions about priorities and tasks, rewards and status; and perceptions of education's future.

Volume I provides a baseline of "normative-descriptive" information about the principal, his views, and his working conditions. This normative survey also provides a data base for the other two phases of the study: (1) an in-depth look at "effective principals" and their significant others (parents, students, teachers, central office); and (2) an examination of future forces and conditions acting upon the high school principalship.

Thus, the three phases of the full study, taken together, provide a comprehensive and dynamic view of the high school principalship. Finally, this Volume I survey is correlated with a study completed and published by National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1965. The results of that study are referred to in this publication where appropriate.

Design of the Study

The survey questionnaire was developed by a research team following an analysis of the 1965 survey and after discussions with the steering committee and with three groups of senior high school principals in different areas of the country. A trial questionnaire of 68 items was field tested, to include 38 items from the 1965 study. The final instrument was approved by the steering committee in February 1977 and data were collected during late spring 1977.

The study design called for data to be gathered under three categories:

- Personal and professional characteristics of persons currently employed as principals;
- Social, economic, political, and educational conditions which define the parameters under which principals must act;
- Opinions and beliefs of principals about selected educational issues, practices, and tasks.

A random sample of 1,600 high school principals was identified as the survey population. For purpose of analysis, data were stratified by geographical region (seven categories), type of community (six categories), size of school (nine categories), type of school (six categories), and per pupil expenditure (eight categories). In each instance all stratifications of the sample were judged to be representative. Of the 1,600 principals to whom questionnaires were mailed, 1,131 returned usable copies within the established time limit, representing a 70.6 percent return.

The 1977 survey instrument was designed to allow analysis of the 1965 data. Two examples, per pupil expenditure and salary levels of principals, illustrate the nature of the comparisons made possible by this design.

In 1965 the lowest category of per pupil expenditure was under $30, representing three percent of the schools in that study; while the highest category was over $700, representing seven percent of the schools. In 1977, the lowest category was under $500, representing three percent of the schools in the study; while the highest category was over $2,400, representing three percent of the schools.

Also, the lowest salary category for principals in 1965 was under $6,000, representing 18 percent of that sample; while the highest salary category was over $17,500, representing one percent of that sample. In 1977, for contrast, the lowest salary category for principals was under $12,000, representing two percent of the survey group while the highest salary category was over $35,000, representing three percent of the principals in this new study. These data are analyzed later in the report according to appropriate independent variables.

The questionnaire developed for the 1977 study includes a number of areas not surveyed in 1965. Questions relating to methods of salary determination, authority and autonomy, number and quality of assistants, ethnicity, and job constraints are some of the new areas investigated. Reactions also were obtained about the educational tasks of high schools, broad educational issues, and specific educational conditions. The nature of community involvement, community-based learning, and funded federal programs are all probed in the 1977 study as well.

Organization of This Report

Data in this report provide a picture of the senior high school principalship today. There is no intent, however, to present a simple snapshot of the principalship. The longitudinal nature of the study as well as the opportunity for analysis, speculation, and projection were carefully considered. The steering committee and the research staff clearly see the principal as participating in a dynamic, changing role. The principalship today is not the principalship of 1965, nor will it be the principalship of 1985.

This report is not an item-by-item list of responses; interrelationships are treated as well as analyses on cross tabulation. Chapters are organized to: (1) describe the personal characteristics of principals; (2) consider the nature of the position; (3) provide views about program and personnel; (4) note the influence of patrons and community; and (5) suggest implications for the future.

The study should encourage all students of the principalship to think beyond the data presented. If this study can create a better understanding of the high school principal and the conditions of the principalship, and serve to identify promising areas for action and for further investigation, it will have accomplished a purpose important to high schools and their work.

The first section of the study reports the personal and professional qualities of the principal in 1977. Where appropriate, data are compared with the 1965 study of the senior high school principalship. The chapter also presents several cross tabulations of personal factors with selected social and educational items. A summary of the findings concludes the chapter.

1 Personal-Professional Characteristics of the High School Principal Today

SOME SIGNIFICANT SHIFTS have occurred since 1965 among persons who occupy the position of high school principal. Not all of these changes could be anticipated. For instance, the typical principal today is less likely to be under age 40 and is less likely to be female than in 1965. Other descriptors of the principal in 1977 are not especially surprising; today's principal is better educated, more experienced, and less likely to have a background in elementary education than did his counterpart in 1965.

PERSONAL FACTORS

Sex Distribution of Principals

Given the emphasis on women's rights and equal employment opportunity, the reduction in the percentage of female principals is surprising.

TABLE 1*
Distribution of Principals by Sex

Sex	1977	1965
Female	7	10
Male	93	89

* All tables represent percentages.

A further analysis of the sex of principals is made later in this chapter.

Age Distribution of Principals

Table 2 describes age distribution in 1965 and 1977. The age distribution in 1977 appears to be more homogeneous than it was 12 years earlier, with 44 percent of the principals between age 40 and 49 in the later survey. In 1977 there were fewer younger

TABLE 2
Distribution of Principals by Age

Years	23 or under	24-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60+
1977	0	1	8	18	22	22	19	8	5
1965	0	4	12	18	16	15	15	12	8

principals and fewer older principals than in 1965. The percentage of principals under 40 years of age decreased from 34 percent to 25 percent over the 12-year period.

Ethnicity of Principals

Relatively few principals today come from ethnic minorities. Less than five in 100 senior high school principals identify their ethnic group as other than white. In the light of the initiatives taken to educate and employ minorities for administrative positions over the past 10 years, these findings are surprising. No ethnic data were collected in the 1965 study. Ethnicity data by school size and region are discussed later in this report.

TABLE 3
Ethnic Distribution of Principals

White	Black	Chicano	American Indian	Asian	Other
96	3	.6	.2	.2	0

Educational Background of Principals

Respondents were asked to report the amount of formal education they had completed. Table 4 shows the distribution of responses across several educational categories and provides comparative findings from the 1965 study.

The responses indicate a considerable increase in the formal preparation of principals. For example, the number of doctorates increased from one in 100 in 1965 to nine in 100 in 1977. Also, in 1965, 49 percent of the principals reported the extent of their formal education to be a master's degree or less; while in 1977, 85 percent reported a formal education beyond the master's degree.

Both studies investigated the major areas of undergraduate work completed by principals. Majors are fairly well diversified with no one subject area dominating the scene. Two changes have occurred since

TABLE 4
Formal Education Completed

	1977	1965		1977	1965
Less than BA	0	0	Master's + Doctoral		
Bachelor's	1	10	course work	9	6
Master's in education	12	35	Specialist degree	9	6
Master's not in education	2	4	Ed.D.—Ph.D.	9	1
Master's degree plus	56	41	Other	2	1

1965, however. First, the percentage of principals with humanities as a major in 1965 was approximately two and one-half times greater than the percentage of principals with that undergraduate major in 1977. Second, the percentage of principals with social science as an undergraduate major in 1977 is nearly twice as great as the percentage of principals reported with that background in 1965.

TABLE 5
Distribution of Undergraduate Majors

	Business	Education	Fine Arts	Humanities	P.E.	Sciences	Social Science	Other
1977	7	12	3	12	17	20	26	2
1965	6	12	2	29	11	18	14	9

Table 6 reports the distribution of graduate majors among principals and provides comparable data from 1965. The major of educational administration dominates the field in both studies. There has been a slight decrease, two percent, of graduate majors outside some

TABLE 6
Graduate Study

Major Field of Graduate Study	1977	1965
Educational administration	71	70
Secondary education	9	12
Physical education	2	1
Other educational specialty	7	3
Humanities, fine arts	4	7
Science, engineering	3	2
Business	0	1
Other	3	2
No graduate study	0	1

specialty in education. Apparently school boards and superintendents do not subscribe to the thesis that anyone, regardless of the area of training, can provide quality leadership and administration in schools.

Career Factors

Initial Appointment and Time in Service

Principals were asked to identify their age when they entered the principalship. Apparently principals are appointed somewhat later in their careers today than they were 12 years ago. For example, in Table 7 some 35 percent of the respondents in 1965 reported they had become principals before age 30, while in 1977, only 22 percent reported that age at initial appointment.

TABLE 7
Age at Initial Appointment

Years	Under 20	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55+
1977	0	3	19	28	24	15	7	3	0
1965	1	9	25	27	18	11	6	3	1

This change in career pattern is further illustrated by the fact that in the 1977 study 49 percent of the initial appointments occurred when principals were 35 years or older, whereas in 1965 only 39 percent of the initial appointments occurred when principals were 35 years of age or older. These findings probably reflect a dramatic reduction in the demand for principals as the school population declines from a post-World War II boom.

No dramatic shifts have occurred over the past 12 years in the amount of time principals serve in the principalship. Table 8 indicates that people remain principals for an extended period of time. Note that 65 percent of the 1977 respondents reported six or more years as a principal. The distribution of responses to two other items suggest that

TABLE 8
Years in the Principalship

Years	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25+
1977	5	14	15	12	11	21	11	6	4
1965	8	14	13	11	10	18	10	6	9

holding a particular principalship for an extended period of time is the career pattern. Table 9 presents the distribution of responses to the number of principalships a person has held.

TABLE 9
Number of Principalships

Number of Principalships	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	Eight +
1977	49	29	15	5	2	1	0	0
1965	48	28	13	6	2	1	1	0

One important issue for principals in the late 1970s is job security and job stability. Apparently, however, stability was not an actual problem in 1977. In fact, the tenure of principals in 1977 is almost identical to the tenure of principals in 1965. This job stability is reflected by the fact that nearly 50 percent of the 1977 respondents had held only one principalship and that 87 percent had held no more than two. This pattern, however, does not account for the fact that the 1965 findings show considerably more principals in the younger age group than in 1977.

Responses to number of years "as principal of their present school" apparently reiterate the theme of stability. Table 10 reports the distribution of these findings from the 1965 and 1977 studies. The age categories of the two studies vary somewhat, but valid comparisons can be made.

TABLE 10
Years as Principal in Current School

Years	Less than 1	1	2	3	4-5	6-8	9-11	12-14	15 +
1977	2	10	13	11	19	21	11	6	6
		1st Year	2	3	4-5	6-8	9-11	12-14	15 +
1965		16	14	12	18	15	9	5	11

Concerning extended service in a particular principalship, note that 63 percent of the 1977 sample had spent four years or more in their current position. A comparison between 1977 and 1965 suggests, at least, that the 1965 findings do reflect younger principals since 30 percent of the principals 12 years ago were in their first or second year in

their present position while only 12 percent fall to these categories in 1977.

Career Routes

An interesting variation in the career route to the principalship occurred between 1965 and 1977. In the earlier study, a sizeable number of respondents had served as elementary school principals (38 percent) or as guidance counselors (48 percent) prior to their appointments to the high school principalship. By 1977, however, only 14 percent of the high school principals had been elementary school principals and only 18 percent had served as counselors. The career backgrounds of principals in 1977 was: high school assistant principal (54 percent), high school athletic director (35 percent), and junior or middle school principal or assistant principal (26 percent).

The shift in career route to the high school principalship probably reflects a number of factors, including: (1) greater specialization of preparation for either the elementary or secondary level of education; (2) greater specialization within secondary education for the fields of guidance and of administration; (3) prominence of the nondirective approach in counseling which may be considered as inappropriate to the administrative role.

Professional Activities

Important to any career pattern is a person's professional participation with peers. While data do not specifically address this question, information about professional activities provides a good picture of peer contact. Table 11 shows the percent of the 1977 sample who participated in various professional activities. To the extent that these

TABLE 11
Professional Activities

	1977
National meeting of NASSP	30
National meetings of other educational organizations	27
State meetings of principals' associations	76
State meetings of other educational organizations	55
Studies through formal courses and workshops for credit	38
Travel for visitation outside of the district	54
Involvement in formal project or research in education	22
Participation in conferences and workshops, not included above and outside of the district	62
Participation in conferences and workshops within district	79
Participation in a study group on a planned, regular basis not included above	29
Other type of professional growth activity, specify	13

data can be used for peer identification they suggest that principals participate more with local or state colleagues than with national groups.

Professional Status, Aspirations, and Satisfaction

Both the 1977 and 1965 studies presented principals with the following statement: "Concern has been expressed that principals, in general, are not afforded the professional status and prestige to which they are properly entitled by virtue of education, training, and the work they do." Asked if they considered this lack of appropriate status a serious problem, 33 percent of the principals in 1965 said status was a serious problem. In 1977, only 14 percent felt it to be a serious problem. This sizable decrease suggests that in the last 12 years the professional self-concept of principals has improved or concern about status and prestige has considerably diminished, or the two changes may have occurred together.

Respondents in both the 1977 and 1965 studies were asked if they aspired to another position in education. Table 12 presents the percentages of the two samples aspiring to other positions, those undecided, and those with no aspirations for movement.

TABLE 12
Principals' Career Aspirations

	1977	1965
Yes, to a principalship in a larger district	4	12
Yes, to a principalship in a smaller district	0	0
Yes, to teaching or counseling	5	5
Yes, to a superintendency or central office position	33	14
Yes, to a junior college position	0	1
Yes, to a college or university position	5	4
Yes, to some other position	5	10
I am undecided	20	25
No	28	28

These data support an earlier suggestion that principals have little interest for lateral career movement within the principalship. Further, they suggest that the disinterest in moving from one principalship to another is greater today than in 1965. A significant difference in the data of the two studies is to increase in the percentage of principals aspiring to the superintendency today. The 1977 percentage is more than twice that of 1965. It is important to note that in both studies approximately 50 percent of the principals said they were undecided about, or not interested in, moving away from the principalship.

Of interest to persons in a given career is the satisfaction enjoyed by others in the field. Although the survey did not pursue job satisfaction in depth, it did include a question which reveals some sense of feeling about career choice. Table 13 shows how principals responded when asked if they would choose educational administration should they have that choice again. To the extent that selecting the same career represents a person's satisfaction with his current profession, these findings indicate that the majority of principals were reasonably satisfied with their choice of careers in 1965 and in 1977.

TABLE 13
Would You Make the Same Career Choice

	1977	1965
Definitely yes	37	60
Probably yes	32	
Uncertain	15	22
Probably not	12	
Definitely not	3	17

Education of High School Principals

The nature of preservice training for the principalship has been a matter of debate and deliberation for many years. Positions have ranged from advocacy for a broadly-learned educational leader to a supra-specialized technical manager. Most preparation programs have represented in actuality a compromise somewhere between the extremes. In the current study, principals were given a list of 25 topics frequently offered as preservice courses in schools of education. Respondents were asked to rate each topic for its utility to the beginning principal. Table 14 gives the distribution of ratings.

Considered highly "essential" by the respondents are school law, school management, curriculum, human relations, and supervision of instruction.

Looking more broadly at preservice education shows 15 courses to be important for the principalship in the view of practitioners. By combining the responses of category No. 3 (highly useful) and category No. 4 (essential) a more complete picture of valuable courses can be determined. A criterion of a 70 percent or more combined response for the two categories was set as the value criterion. Listed on the next page are the 15 courses meeting that criterion, according to the combined percentages of the two categories in Table 14. The number in parentheses represents the percentage of the sample rating the item (3) or (4).

TABLE 14
Utility of Preparation Course Work

Course Work	Of No Use	Somewhat Useful	Highly Useful Not Essential	Essential
Administrative Theory	[illegible]	36	29	32
Child and Adolescent Development	[illegible]	20	28	50
Community Relations	[illegible]	12	28	59
Comparative Education	10	50	33	7
Counseling and Guidance Theory and Practice	2	24	42	33
Curriculum and Program Development	0	4	20	76
History of Education	18	58	19	5
Human Relations	1	6	22	71
Internship and Field Experience	1	12	41	46
Leadership	2	9	27	63
Negotiations	4	26	39	31
Personnel Administration	1	8	33	58
Philosophy of Education	10	39	30	21
Political Science and Politics of Education	10	44	34	12
Psychology of Learning	3	21	38	38
Research Methodology	9	43	35	13
Secondary School Principalship	12	7	28	64
School Finance and Budgeting	1	8	28	64
School Law	0	4	18	77
School Management	0	4	22	74
Social and Economic Context of Contemporary Education	8	41	41	11
Supervision of Instruction	1	4	24	71
Tests and Measurement	4	30	43	23
Vocational Education	4	31	45	21

Highest Rated Courses

School management (96)
Curriculum and program development (96)
School law (95)
Supervision of instruction (95)
Human Relations (93)
Secondary school principalship (92)
School finance and budgeting (92)
Personnel administration (91)
Leadership (90)
Community relations (87)
Internship and field experience (87)
Child and adolescent development (78)
Psychology of learning (76)
Counseling and guidance theory and practice (75)
Negotiations (70)

9

The 1965 study included a similar question. While course listings did not directly match those offered in 1977, sufficient similarity exists to make a comparison. In 1965 the distribution of responses was such that 40 percent rating an item essential (4) was considered significant. Table 15 reports the five most essential courses from both studies. In comparing the two studies note that principals have retained a perception of essentiality for three areas of study: (1) curriculum and program development; (2) human relations; and (3) supervision of instruction.

TABLE 15
Most Essential Courses

Course	1977 Percent Rated Essential	1965 Percent Rated Essential
School Law	77	32
Curriculum and Program Development	76	51
School Management	74	26
Supervision of Instruction	71	56
Human Relations	71	45
Administrative Theory and Practice	32	41
Secondary School Organization	*	42

*Item not included in 1977 study.

The considerable increase in the perceived importance of school law and school management deserves comment. One may speculate about reasons for the increase, with the most obvious being: (1) the major impact of court decisions and federal legislation; (2) the influence of the accountability movement; and (3) the demand for efficiency of operation.

A final comparative note should be made about the sizable decrease of principals who consider administrative theory and practice as essential. The so-called "theory based movement" was at the zenith of popularity in the early 1960s. The 1977 decrease apparently reflects a disenchantment with the "theory movement" parallel to that occurring in departments of educational administration during the past few years.

The 1965 study concluded: "In short, it appears that courses that are directly related to the principal's job as an educational administrator are considered to be more essential than those that treat education more broadly." The findings of the current study strongly suggest a continuance of that view and imply that school law and effective management have grown in impact upon the principal's job during the last 12 years. This shift might imply that the concept of the principal as

instructional leader is seen as less important today. The continuing importance of curriculum, educational program, human relations, and supervision of instruction, however, caution seriously against such an intuitive leap.

Professional Resources

High school principals have a wide range of professional periodicals and special reports available to them. Which ones do principals prefer? A fair assumption is that professional articles reaching principals will have much impact on the high schools of the nation.

It appears that the principal relies primarily upon four professional publications: (1) the *NASSP Bulletin,* (2) the *Phi Delta Kappan,* (3) *Education U.S.A.,* and (4) *Education Digest.* Principals were asked to rank those periodicals most regularly read during the past school year and also to rank those periodicals of "greatest importance" to the respondent. A score of "1" indicates the periodical of greatest use.

TABLE 16
Professional Periodicals, 1977

	Read	*Importance*
Administrator's Science Quarterly	5.0	4.6
Education Digest	2.9	2.9
Educational Leadership	3.2	3.0
Education U.S.A.	2.7	2.8
Harvard Educational Review	5.2	5.4
Momentum/Today's Catholic Teacher	4.2	3.9
NASSP Bulletin	1.2	1.2
National Elementary Principal	8.6	8.7
Regional Accreditation Assn. Quarterlies	3.6	3.6
Phi Delta Kappan	2.5	2.4
Saturday Review	4.1	4.4
Teachers College Record	8.4	9.1

11

During the period 1973-1976 a number of national reports on secondary education were developed and circulated to the profession and the public at large. Collectively entitled "The New Reform Movement," these publications tended to make certain common recommendations such as the expansion of community learning opportunities for youth, a review of high school graduation requirements, and a new look at compulsory education.

Principals were asked to identify which of these reports they had read during the "past three or four years." They also were asked to designate which of the reports had actually been used in their schools.

TABLE 17
National "Reform" Reports on Secondary Education by Percentage, 1977

Read	*Used*	
32	13	*New Roles for Youth in the School and Community*, Report of National Commission on Resources for Youth
14	05	*RISE*, Report of California Commission for Reform of Intermediate and Secondary Education
83	49	*Secondary Schools in a Changing Society: This We Believe*, NASSP Task Force
14	05	*The Adolescent, Other Citizens, and Their High Schools*, Task Force '74, Kettering Foundation
21	08	*The Education of Adolescents*, Report of National Panel on High Schools and Adolescent Education, HEW
49	22	*The Reform of Secondary Education*, Report of National Commission, Kettering Foundation
12	10	*To Teach as Jesus Did*, National Conference of Catholic Bishops
29	14	*Vitalizing the High School*, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
28	11	*Youth: Transition to Adulthood*, President's Advisory Panel on Youth

As can be seen by the percentage figures, most principals read more than one of these national reports. The tendency was for about half as many principals to use the reports as had read them.

Cross-tabulation of Data

Like most surveys, this study aimed at a description of its population. Scales of measurement were not used to allow for inferential statistical analysis. Most of the data collected would be accurately classified as categorical. It is possible, however, to extend the analysis beyond a description of the total samples' distribution of responses across categories. An efficient way to do this is to use cross-tabulations which allow for an analysis of sub-population distributions across selected categories. In each chapter certain of the major factors have been divided into sub-populations and cross-tabulated with selected items on the questionnaire.

In this section findings of several cross-tabulations on the personal factors of sex, age, and ethnicity are reported. These factors and others considered in this chapter are further analyzed later where appropriate.

Gender of High School Principals

A surprising finding reported earlier is that the percentage of female principals has decreased since 1965.

Table 18 shows the distribution of principals across various geographical regions by sex of the principal. An analysis of these data concludes that:

- Only 18 percent of principals come from the Mid-Atlantic region yet 35 percent of female principals come from that region.
- No female principals were reported in the Intermountain West.
- Only nine percent of principals come from New England yet 15 percent of female principals come from that region.
- Only six percent of principals come from the West Coast yet 11 percent of female principals come from that region.
- 66 percent of principals come from the Midwest, South, Southwest, and Intermountain West yet only 39 percent of principals come from those regions.

When sex was considered by size of school, more female principals than male principals are in small high schools. Two findings make that pattern rather clear: first, 75 percent of female principals work in schools of 745 students or less while only 37 percent of male principals are employed in these smaller schools; second, 14 percent of male principals are found in schools of 2,000 or more students while only one percent of female principals are found in these larger schools.

TABLE 18
Sex by Region

	Northeast	*Mid-Atlantic*	*South*	*Midwest*	*Southwest*	*Intermountain West*	*West Coast*
Male	9	18	15	40	9	3	6
Female	15	35	7	29	3	0	11
Total Sample	9	18	14	40	9	3	6

13

In the total sample the ratio of female to male principals is seven to 100. Table 19 shows the female/male ratio in terms of various population categories.

The pattern of employment is obvious from this table; the smaller the city or town the smaller the percentage of females found in the principalship. The cross-tabulations that led to the above data provided two other findings which emphasize the point of female principals being found much more regularly in larger population centers. First,

TABLE 19
Sex Ratio in Population Categories

	Total Sample	City 1,000,000 +	City 999,999-150,000	Suburb 15,000 +	City 149,999-25,000	City 24,999-5,000	Town or Rural 4,999 or less
Ratio Female/ Male	7/100	28/100	12/100	13/100	7/100	2/100	1.5/100

70 percent of female principals practice in the three largest population categories while 67 percent of the males hold positions in the three smaller population categories. Second, 48 percent of all principals work in cities or towns of 24,999 or less while only 14 percent of female principals have positions in cities or towns with populations of less than 149,999.

Cross-tabulations of female and male principals with various age categories showed the distribution of age for both sexes very similar. As an example, 53 percent of male principals and 52 percent of female principals were 45 years of age or older.

Major differences between male and female principals occurred when sex was cross-tabulated with types of schools. Table 20 shows the findings of that analysis.

TABLE 20
Sex by School Type

	Public Comprehensive	Public Alternative	Public Special	Parochial	Private Religious	Private Non-Religious
Women	16	0	3	28	53	0
Men	87	2	2	4	4	1
Total	83	1	2	6	7	1

14

One point characterizes an important fact about male and female principals: 91 percent of male principals work in public schools but only 19 percent of female principals have employment there. This reality may help to explain the earlier reported findings that female principals tend to practice in smaller schools and in larger urban areas.

The 1965 study found female principals most often in urban schools, independent schools, and schools in the Northeast. The study concluded that "the great majority of American senior high school principals are men." The 1977 study suggests that little change, indeed, has occurred over the past 12 years despite affirmative action programs.

Age of High School Principals

As pointed out earlier about the age distribution of principals in the 1977 study, 44 percent of the principals in the national sample were between 40 and 49 years of age. Another observation is that age distribution today seems more homogeneous than it was in 1965.

Table 21 shows the distribution of principals across age categories for each geographical region in the 1977 study.

A key finding here is the difference between the age distribution of principals on the West Coast and other regions of the nation. On the West Coast more than 60 percent of the principals are between 40 and 49 while elsewhere their ages are evenly distributed.

TABLE 21
Region by Age

Age	New England	Mid-Atlantic	South	Midwest	Southwest	Intermountain West	West Coast	Total
20-39	24	20	30	37	27	28	11	25
40-49	39	42	42	44	35	42	61	43
50 or more	37	38	28	29	38	30	28	32
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 22 shows the distribution of principals in age categories across sizes of schools. This table clearly reveals that younger principals tend to administer small schools and that principalships in large schools tend to be held by older persons. Other points made from this cross-tabulation verify these findings; for example, 75 percent of the principals were 40 or older, yet 92 percent of the principals in schools over 2,000 were 40 or older. Lending further emphasis is the fact that 80 percent of principals under 35 years of age were working in the smallest student size category. Finally, 44 percent of principals in large schools, 2,000 +, are 50 or older and yet only 32 percent of all principals are 50 or older.

TABLE 22
Age by School Size

	Students Enrolled		
Age	0-999	1,000-1,999	2,000 or more
20-39	68	28	4
40-49	52	34	14
50 or more	42	40	18

As a final analysis principals' ages were cross-tabulated with population categories of cities and towns. Table 23 below shows the distribution of principals according to age for six different population categories.

TABLE 23
Population by Principal's Age

Size	Years 20-39	40-49	50+
City—1,000,000 +	12	44	44
City—999,999-150,000	22	36	41
Suburb—150,000 +	23	48	29
City—148,999-25,000	20	44	36
City—24,999-5,000	25	43	32
Town or rural—4,999 or less	32	42	26
Total	25	43	32

This table reveals three general points: (1) as the size of the city increases the percentage of younger principals decreases; (2) the percentage of middle-aged principals remains fairly stable in each population category; and, (3) with one exception—the category of suburban communities—the percentage of older principals increases as the size of the city increases. This corresponds with the finding of the 1965 study that urban principals tended to be somewhat older than principals generally.

Ethnicity

As reported earlier in this chapter, fewer than five percent of the principals in senior high schools come from an ethnic minority. In order to gather a large enough sample to run a cross-tabular analysis, all minorities were treated as one category.

Table 24 shows the distribution of minority and non-minority principals across geographic regions. Several points may be made from this analysis. While only 15 percent of principals hold positions in the South, 38 percent of all minority principals were employed in the South. Similarly, principals in the Southwest represent only nine percent of all principals, yet 20 percent of all minority principals are found in this region.

A reverse kind of situation exists in the Midwest, where we find 40 percent of all principals but only 14 percent of all minority principals. Lastly, we note that on the West Coast the percentage of minority principals approximates the percentage of all principals found on the West Coast.

TABLE 24
Region by Ethnicity

	Northeast	Mid-Atlantic	South	Midwest	Southwest	Intermountain West	West Coast
Non-white	2	17	38	15	21	0	6
White	9	19	13	41	8	3	6
Total	9	18	15	40	9	3	6

Table 25 shows the distribution of minority and non-minority principals across various population categories. These findings point out clear and distinct differences between minority and non-minority principals. Fifty percent of non-minority principals, compared to 24 of minority principals, work in cities or towns with populations under 25,000. In the reverse direction, 42 percent of minority principals work in the two largest city categories while only 13 percent of non-minority principals hold positions in these large areas. Finally, 72 percent of non-minority principals work in suburbs or small cities and towns while only 28 percent of minority principals work in these kinds of population areas.

TABLE 25
Ethnicity by Population

	City 1,000,000 +	City 999,999-150,000	Suburb of City more than 150,000	City 149,999-25,000	City 24,999-5,000	Town or Rural 4,999 or less
Minority	19	23	4	29	8	16
Non-minority	5	8	22	15	21	29

Consistent with the findings which generally place minority principals in large urban areas are the results of an analysis of ethnicity and school size. Three findings make the point that minority principals differ considerably in type of school from non-minority principals:

- First, 54 percent of non-minority principals hold positions in smaller schools, 999 or less students. Only 35 percent of minority principals have jobs in smaller schools.
- Second, 44 percent of minority principals have principalships in medium sized schools, 1,000 to 1,999 students. Only 34 percent of non-minority principals work in medium sized schools.
- Third, 21 percent of minority principals work in schools greater than 2,000 students while only 12 percent of non-minority principals are found in these larger schools.

The 1965 study does not provide data on ethnicity; therefore, comparisons cannot be made.

Summary

Personal Characteristics of Principals

- The 1965 study of principals concluded that the senior high school principalship was a male-dominated profession. The 1977 study gives evidence that it continues to be a white male dominated profession. The typical female principal in 1977 might be characterized as working in a small parochial or private religious school in a large urban area located in the New England or Mid-Atlantic states.

- A profile of the typical minority principal shows him to be working in a large high school in a large urban area probably located in the South, Southwest, or West Coast.

- In 1977 there are fewer younger and fewer older principals in the field than in 1965. Similar to 1965, principalships in large high schools tend to be held by older principals. Younger principals in 1977 tend to hold positions in small schools located in smaller population centers.

- In 1977 more than eight in 10 principals had completed formal education beyond a master's degree while in 1965 only five in 10 principals had earned a master's degree. A sizable decrease in principals with an undergraduate major in humanities and a sizable increase in principals with background in the social sciences has occurred since 1965. Educational administration is the dominant major area of graduate study.

Career Factors in the Principalship

- The initial appointment to a principalship is occurring in the late 1970s at a later age than in 1965. This change may reflect a decrease in the availability of new principalships. Such a conclusion seems to be consistent with the national decline in student enrollment, the trend toward consolidation, and the growth of larger schools reported later in this study.

- Principals tend to serve in one position for an extended period of time. Findings on career aspirations indicate that for a significant number the principalship is the choice as a final career field.

- Principals seem reasonably well satisfied with their career choice of school administration. They evidently are less concerned in 1977 about public status and prestige than they were in 1965.

- A substantial increase in the percentage of principals who aspire to the superintendency or other central office positions can be noted. This career aspiration may reflect, in part, a dramatic increase in the formal education of principals since 1965.

2 Job Tasks and Problems

CASUAL OBSERVATION SUGGESTS that high schools have changed considerably during the past decade. New social expectations, different programatic demands, changing lifestyles, shifts in the priorities of parents and students, the surge of litigation, and the growth of categorical funding should cause high schools of the late 1970s to be quite different places than were high schools of the 1960s.

Add to these social transformations the advent of professional negotiations by teachers and the judgment that the age of majority should be reduced to 18 years, and the pervasive nature of change comes into focus.

How have these many shifts in the life of the school affected the principalship? How do the tasks and duties of 1977 compare with the tasks and duties of 1965? How have support systems changed and what new educational priorities dictate revisions in the nature of the job? What major problems are encountered as the principalship role is lived month by month?

This second chapter examines these questions even as it continues to portray the principal as the central figure in the high school of both periods. The nature of the job, then, is the focus of this section of the report.

Activities and Tasks of the Principal

The length of the high school principal's work week is the first factor of change reported. The median work week was 56.5 hours in 1977, some 2.5 hours more than the median work week of 54 hours reported by principals in 1965. The data from Table 26 suggest that all principals surveyed work over 40 hours per week.

A comparison between the number of working hours per week of principals today and principals a decade or so ago reveals that fewer principals today work more than 60 hours than in 1965; yet, almost one out of every 12 principals in 1965 spent less than 40 hours per week at work.

How principals spend their time on the job has considerable interest. For this reason, principals were asked if they used their time doing

TABLE 26
Average Work Week of Principals

Hours Per Week	Total Sample, 1977	Categories for Comparison 1977	1965
60 or more	22	22	29
55 to 59	26	61	45
50-54	35		
45 to 49	14	17	17
40 to 44	3		
Less than 40	0	0	8

things they thought to be more important. They were also asked to describe their typical work week by ranking nine areas according to the amount of time spent in each area. Moreover, principals were asked to rank the nine areas according to the amount of time they felt they should spend on each. The results are presented in Table 27. These rankings were derived from the median scores of each area. A rank of 1 indicates the greatest amount of time; a rank of 9 indicates least amount of time. The results illustrate how a typical principal allocates his time.

TABLE 27
Allocation of Time for a Typical Work Week

Area of Responsibility	Do Spend Time	Should Spend Time
School management	1	3
Personnel	2	2
Student activities	3	4
Student behavior	4	7
Program development	5	1
District office	6	9
Planning	7	5
Community	8	8
Professional development	9	6

20

The area of program development ranked highest among the 11 alternatives in the way high school principals felt they should spend their time. Personnel management and student activities were ranked second and third, respectively. Of particular interest is that four of the top five rankings in both columns are the same. Generally speaking, principals actually spend most of their time on the areas they think they should, but in a different order in terms of amount of time spent. In the 1965 study the three most time-consuming activities were administrative planning, student activities, and staff development; in

the 1977 study they were school management, personnel management, and student activities.

To learn how much time principals spend in teaching activities a specific inquiry was included in the questionnaire. A comparison of the answers in 1977 to those in 1965 reveals that fewer principals today have substantial teaching responsibilities than a decade ago. This percentage is directly related to increase in school size as reported in Chapter 3. These data are presented in Table 28.

TABLE 28
Teaching Responsibility of Principals

1977		*1965*	
No	85	No	65
Yes, incidentally by choice	9	Yes, less than half-time	26
Yes, less than half-time but regularly	4	Yes, more than half-time	9
Yes, more than half-time	0		

Administrative Support

The amount of administrative assistance available to principals can be a critical factor in how well they succeed in fulfilling their duties. Questions related to this area asked participating principals about the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) administrators (assistant principal, dean, activity director, hall principal, guidance director, etc.) assigned to their schools other than the principal. The results from this question are presented in Table 29.

One out of every six schools (16 percent) has five or more administrative assistants; one out of every four (21 percent) has fewer than 1.4 FTE assistants.

TABLE 29
Administrative Assistants to the Principal

Administrators Assigned to the School, not Including the Principal	*Total*
0 to 1.4	21
1.5 to 1.9	8
2.0 to 2.4	18
2.5 to 2.9	5
3.0 to 3.4	17
3.5 to 3.9	4
4.0 to 4.4	9
4.5 to 4.9	2
5.0 or more	16

Table 30 sheds light on the question of a possible relationship between school enrollment and the number of administrative assistants assigned to a school. Note that 27 percent of the principals had four or more assistants, while 27 percent of the schools had 1,500 or more students enrolled at the close of the 1976-77 school year. The 21 percent of the principals reporting 0-1.4 FTE assistants represent high schools with under 500 students.

TABLE 30
Student Enrollment and Administrative Assistants to the Principal

Number of Students	*Total*	*Number of Administrative Ass'ts*	*Total*
499 or less	24	0 to 1.4	21
500 to 999	39	1.5 to 2.9	31
1,000 to 1,499	20	3.0 to 3.9	21
1,500 or more	27	4.0 or more	27

Some of the more intangible aspects of the principalship were examined through a series of questions concerning the principals' perceptions about their work via specific dimensions. Five questions related to the following characteristics: job security, opportunity to help others, prestige of the principalship, opportunity for independent thought and action, and self-fulfillment. Respondents were asked to decide for each area what the state of affairs actually is, and what it should be. The responses are shown in Table 31. The rating scale has a range of 1 (little) to 5 (considerable).

In almost every case it appears that the actual amount of job security has increased since 1965. Almost 100 percent of the principals felt that they should have at least a moderate amount of job security, while some 83 percent thought that their jobs were moderately secure.

Concerning the opportunity to help others, the data indicate that there is little difference from 1965. About 96 percent of the respondents indicated a strong need for this opportunity in the way they thought the situation should ideally be.

22

When asked about prestige, however, principals said they do not command as much prestige as they would like to have. It appears, however, that the amount of prestige enjoyed by secondary school principals has increased in the past decade, with 87 percent of the 1965 respondents and 95 percent of the 1977 respondents stating that they enjoy moderate to considerable levels of prestige.

The data indicate that little change has occurred since 1965 for opportunity for independent thought and action. About nine out of every 10 principals reported that they have at least a moderate amount of autonomy in their jobs; yet, 100 percent of this group feel that they should have conditions which provide for at least a moderate amount.

TABLE 31
Principals' Ratings of Job Characteristics

Rating	Ideal 1977	Actual 1977	Actual 1965
Job Security			
1 (Little)	1	10	15
2	1	7	11
3 (Moderate)	20	25	24
4	43	31	29
5 (Considerable)	36	27	20
	101	100	99
Opportunity To Help Others			
1 (Little)	0	1	1
2	0	2	7
3 (Moderate)	4	21	21
4	25	30	44
5 (Considerable)	71	46	27
	100	100	100
Prestige			
1 (Little)	0	1	3
2	0	4	11
3 (Moderate)	18	30	37
4	41	35	39
5 (Considerable)	40	30	11
	99	100	101
Independent Thought & Action			
1 (Little)	0	2	5
2	0	10	14
3 (Moderate)	7	34	33
4	43	33	37
5 (Considerable)	50	21	11
	100	100	100
Self-Fulfillment			
1 (Little)	0	2	4
2	0	7	14
3 (Moderate)	3	30	33
4	31	33	36
5 (Considerable)	66	27	12
	100	99	99

23

To assess the dimension of self-fulfillment of the principal in his work, a question was posed to which approximately one out of every four principals stated that they were quite self-fulfilled, while only about one out of every eight in 1965 reported that same condition. So it appears that in 1977 principals were more satisfied in this area than in 1965. There seems to be some discrepancy, however, between the amount of fulfillment principals ideally would like to have in the "from moderate to considerable" category of alternatives, with 97 percent stating they would like to have a considerable or slightly less

than considerable amount of self-fulfillment and 60 percent reporting that they actually did have this much fulfillment.

Perhaps these data help show principals' perceptions of the more intangible areas of their job and help others better understand the way in which principals in general interpret their positions.

Several questions included in the study focused on the authority or extent of participation of the principal in the areas of the allocation of funds, staff selection, budget allocation, and hiring practices. The information in Table 32 provides an overall picture of the principals' perceptions of the scope of their authority in these areas.

TABLE 32
Scope of Authority of Principals
in Certain Decision Functions

Function	*Unrestricted Authority or Participation*	*Authority with Restriction or Moderate Participation*	*Little Authority*	*No Authority*
Allocation of discretionary funds	19	58	16	6
Participation in budget allocation	37	30	21	12
Authority in staffing practices	16	51	20	12
Participation in staff selection	51	41	0	8

The area in which they reported having the most authority was teacher selection. More than half the principals have complete authority in making selections to fill teacher vacancies in their schools; in addition, another 40 percent reported that they choose teachers to fill vacancies within limited options given by the central office.

Questioned about the extent of their authority to approve the allocation of discretionary funds within their school budgets, about three out of every five principals reported that they had authority with some restrictions while about one in five said they had unrestricted authority in this activity.

One-third of the respondents reported that they have little or no participation in the determination of the budget for their respective schools, and approximately another third reported that they participated only moderately.

When asked about their authority to make choices between hiring one full-time teacher or some alternative choice such as hiring two teacher aides, more than half of the principals reported having at least some authority with restriction, while another 16 percent had unrestricted authority in making the choice.

The information from these four questions suggests that most principals feel that they have a reasonable amount of authority and a substantial degree of participation in matters of staffing, budget determination, and allocation of funds.

Problems of the Job

The respondents in the 1977 study were requested to specify which of 18 alternatives were factors in preventing or hindering them in the successful completion of their jobs. The responses (Table 33) indicate the percentage of principals who believe that the described condition was indeed an obstacle or "roadblock" in the achievement of their job objectives. As shown in this table the most frequently reported interference factors were: (1) time taken up by administrative detail; (2) lack of time; and, (3) variations in the ability of teachers. The three most frequently reported obstacles in the 1965 study were identical to those in this study, but in a different order.

In general in the 1977 survey the principals felt that in order to assist schools in realizing an effective educational program they must be given more freedom from administrative detail and trivia.

TABLE 33
Administrative Roadblocks

Alternative	*1977*	*1965*
Time taken up by administrative detail	90	87
Lack of time	86	86
Variations in the ability of teachers	84	88
Inability to obtain funds	79	*
Apathetic or irresponsible parents	79	*
Problem students	76	*
Insufficient space and physical facilities	66	78
Inability to provide teacher time	59	83
Tendency of older teachers to frown on new methods	56	64
Defective communications	54	41
Teacher tenure	50	45
Compulsory school attendance	50	35
Collective bargaining agreement	41	*
Longstanding traditions	40	47
Superintendent or central office staff do not measure up to expectations	38	42
Lack of district-wide flexibility	35	33
Lack of competent office help	24	46
Student body too large	20	*

* Not included in the 1965 study.

The practice of local control of schools is a tradition in this country, and at times there are pressures from certain groups of individuals either at the local or state levels. To determine the degree of influence of certain pressure or interest groups outside the school, principals were asked to indicate the strength or impact of each group on changes in the operation of the school. The entries in Table 34 reflect the percent of principals who responded either "great deal of influence" or

TABLE 34
Extent of Influence of Interest Groups on the School

Group	1977	1965
Athletic-minded persons (especially alumni)	48	51
Extreme right-wing individuals or groups	9	18
Extreme left-wing individuals or groups	4	12
Individuals or groups seeking to censor books	5	17
State legislature investigating committees	4	9
State college and/or universities	13	46
Automobile associations, insurance companies, etc.	6	31
Individuals, groups concerned about testing programs	12	33
Individuals, groups concerned with implementation of various recommendations of national reports, studies, etc.	11	30
Religious or church groups	17	35
Local newspapers and other media editorial policy	24	31
That element of the business community which employs students or graduates	27	25
Other elements in the business community	12	20
Local labor organizations	3	3
Citizen or parent groups (other than PTA)	34	56
Women's rights or minority group organizations	13	*
Legal aid groups	5	*
State teachers' organizations	40	*

*Not included in the 1965 study.

"moderate influence" in the 1977 study and "strong or frequent pressure" or "occasional or moderate pressure" in the 1965 study.

The three most frequently reported groups in 1977 were "athletic-minded persons" (48 percent), "state teachers' organizations" (40 percent), and "citizen or parent groups (other than PTA)" (34 percent). Two of these three groups were also reported most frequently in the 1965 study with "state teachers' organizations" replacing "state colleges and/or universities" from the 1965 study. Interestingly, in 1977 about four out of five respondents reported that "local labor organizations" and "state legislative investigating committees" had no influence.

Salary

26

In order to analyze the salary factor it is necessary first to point out some descriptive facts related to the rise in the cost of living. Since the data were gathered for the 1965 study, the consumer price index has risen drastically; therefore, the various salary ranges in the 1965 study have been converted to corresponding salary ranges for prices and cost-of-living factors in society today using a conversion factor of 87.5 percent, an approximation in the rise in the cost of living since 1964. It should be also pointed out that these data on Table 35 include principals who are members of religious orders and thus receive little or no salary.

TABLE 35
Salary

Salary Range	*1977*	*Salary Range*	*1965*
Under $12,000	2	Less than $6,000 (*11,250)	18
$12,000 to $15,999	4	$6,000 to $8,999 (*$11,250 to $13,123)	12
$16,000 to $19,999	20	$7,000 to $7,999 (*$13,125 to $14,958)	16
$20,000 to $23,999	28	$8,000 to $8,999 (*$15,000 to $16,873)	15
$24,000 to $27,999	23	$9,000 to $9,999 (*$16,875 to $18,745)	11
$28,000 to $31,999	10	$10,000 to $12,499 (*$18,750 to $23,436)	17
$32,000 to $34,999	4	$12,500 to $15,000 (*$23,438 to $28,125)	7
$35,000 or more	3	$15,000 to $17,500 (*$28,125 to $32,812)	2
Does not apply (religious order)	7	More than $17,500 (*$32,812)	1

* Salary range approximated in terms of 1977 dollars

The median salary of the total sample of principals was about $25,600 in 1977, as compared to the adjusted median salary of $15,750 in 1965. In general it appears that principals have made salary gains in terms of "real dollars" since 1965. For example, in 1965 only 10 percent of the sample reported a salary comparable to the $24,000 or over range, while in 1977 40 percent of the principals had salaries in that range. However, two factors should be considered when assessing the gain: the increase in the number of years of training attained by principals and the increase in the size of schools. As reported elsewhere, there has been considerable increase in the number of years of formal training of school principals. Data in Chapter 3 point to a marked increase in average school enrollment since 1965 also.

For most of the following discussions and throughout the remaining tables, the salary data have been adjusted to eliminate or control low salaries due to religious order affiliation. The information in Table 36 suggests that salary is partially a function of age. The majority of younger principals (under 35 years) have salaries in the lower range. The average salaries of the majority of principals in the other age categories fall into the middle range. It was found that only five percent of the principals under 40 years of age had salaries of $28,000 or more; yet, one-fourth of the principals over 49 years of age had salaries in this category. (See Table 36.)

TABLE 36
A Comparison of Salary by Age

Age of Principal	*Under $20,000*	*$20,000 to $27,999*	*$28,000 or more*
39 years or younger	46	49	5
40 to 49 years	23	58	19
50 years or older	18	57	25
Total Sample	27	54	19

To determine if a relationship exists between the age of a principal and his salary, an analysis of the figures in Table 37 may be helpful. In this table the data suggest that as the age of a principal increases, so does his salary. The underlying assumption is that he increases his experience and knowledge base as he grows older and thus becomes a more valuable employee to the school district.

TABLE 37
A Comparison of Salaries by Age

Age of the Principal	*Under $20,000*	*$20,000 to $27,999*	*$28,000 or more*
34 years or younger	61	34	4
35 to 39 years	39	54	8
40 to 49 years	25	60	16
45 to 49 years	22	56	22
50 to 54 years	19	54	16
55 years or older	18	55	27
Total Sample	27	54	19

The data summarized in Table 38 suggest that race or ethnicity is not a significant factor in salary variation. A cursory comparison of salaries by race reveals no large differences within the various ranges.

TABLE 38
A Comparison of Salary by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	*Under $20,000*	*$20,000 to $27,999*	*$28,000 or more*
White	27	54	19
Non-white	31	52	17
Total Sample	27	54	19

The data in Table 39 indicate pronounced regional differences in salaries. For example, about 43 percent of the principals in the South have salaries under $20,000, and 42 percent of the principals in the Southwest have salaries in this same range; yet, only 12 percent of the principals in the Mid-Atlantic region earn wages within those same limits. The Mid-Atlantic and West Coast regions appear to maintain a larger percentage of their principals in the upper salary levels.

TABLE 39
A Comparison of Salaries by Regions

	Salary (in dollars)							
Region	Under 12,000	12,000-15,999	16,000-19,999	20,000-23,999	24,000-27,999	28,000-31,999	32,000-34,999	35,000 or more
New England	2	6	15	19	40	13	3	2
Mid-Atlantic	3	2	7	24	22	19	11	12
South	0	4	39	42	13	1	1	0
Midwest	3	3	20	32	26	11	4	1
Southwest	2	5	35	31	23	3	1	0
Intermountain	0	11	25	33	25	0	6	0
West Coast	2	3	14	16	27	24	6	8
Total Sample	2	4	21	30	24	11	5	3

The topic of salary was also examined using gender of the principals as the distinguishing factor. Since many of the women respondents in this study were nuns, the salary information was adjusted to allow for this affiliation with a religious order. The adjusted data in Table 40 disclose great disparity between the salaries of males and females. For instance, 70 percent of the female principals have salaries under $20,000; yet only 25 percent of the male principals have salaries in this range. Salaries in the higher range ($28,000 and over) seem to be more equitably distributed with 15 percent of the female principals and 18 percent of the male principals earning salaries within these boundaries.

TABLE 40
A Comparison of Salaries by Sex

Sex	Under 12,000	12,000-15,999	16,000-19,999	20,000-23,999	24,000-27,999	28,000-31,999	32,000-34,999	35,000 or more
Male	1	4	21	31	25	11	4	3
Female	42	10	18	3	12	3	9	3
Total Sample	2	4	21	30	24	11	5	3

An analysis of Table 41 and its data disclose a possible relationship between the size of the school and the salary of its principal. In schools having fewer than 500 pupils, 19 percent of the principals have salaries under $16,000, while in schools with 1,000 students or more only one percent of the principals have salaries in that range. These findings show that in general the salary of the principal is directly proportional to the enrollment of his school.

TABLE 41
A Comparison of Salaries by School Enrollment

Number of students	*Under $16,000*	*$16,000 to $23,999*	*$24,000 to $31,999*	*$32,000 or more*
499 or less	19	70	9	2
500 to 999	5	72	22	1
1,000 to 1,999	1	36	54	9
2,000 or more	0	16	54	30
Total Sample	6	51	35	8

Table 42 reflects the various methods used by school systems to determine the salaries of principals. The salary of one out of every four

TABLE 42
Basis for Determination of Salary

Basis for Determination	*Under $12,000*	*$12,000-$15,999*	*$16,000-$19,999*	*$20,000-$23,999*	*$24,000-$27,999*	*$28,000-$31,999*	*$32,000-$34,999*	*35,000 or more*
Tied to a percentage of a step in the teacher salary schedule	0	2	16	28	32	18	2	2
Level in teacher salary schedule plus an increment for administration	0	6	38	36	13	6	2	0
Separate negotiations of an administrative bargaining unit	0	3	6	18	32	19	11	11
Independently arrived at by board decision	0	5	28	33	23	6	3	2
Negotiated on an individual basis	1	6	40	36	11	3	2	1
Established administrative schedule	1	3	12	34	30	13	5	2
Total Sample	1	4	21	30	24	11	5	3

principals is independently reached by school board decision. In 1965, the salaries of about 36 percent of the principals were determined by an index ratio above the salary of a teacher. This approach is not as common today, with only 21 percent of the responding principals indicating that salaries were directly connected with a teacher salary schedule. Approximately 41 percent of the principals whose salaries are negotiated separately by an administrative bargaining unit have salaries of at least $28,000. The group having the next closest percentage of salaries in this range (22 percent) is composed of principals whose salaries are tied to a percentage of a step in the teacher salary schedule.

Summary

- In this chapter several topics related to the job of the secondary school principal were examined. The data indicate some shifts since 1965 in work patterns and other areas of administration. The length of the principal's work week has increased approximately two and one-half hours. Significantly less time is spent teaching than in 1965 and more time is required in school management. The principal would like to give top priority, however, to program development.

- The amount of prestige and self-fulfillment associated with the principalship has increased over the years. Data indicate that the majority of principals have ample opportunity for independent thought and action and enjoy moderate to considerable job security. Most principals feel that they have a reasonable amount of authority in the area of staff selection but that they participate only to a moderate degree in matters involving the budget.

- The three obstacles to the accomplishment of job tasks mentioned most frequently in the 1965 study were identical to the hindrances identified in this study. The most frequent barrier involves the excessive time demands of administrative detail. Exerting the most influence or pressure on the school externally were "athletic-minded persons."

- The salary question revealed some interesting data. The median salary has increased since 1965 in terms of "real dollars" after controlling for inflation. It was found that such factors as age of the principal, the size of the school, the region where he is located, and the gender of the principal are all directly related to his salary. In conclusion it should be noted that the basis used for determining salary seems also to be a critical factor when analyzing salary variations.

3 School, Program, and Personnel Factors

IMPORTANT TO DETERMINING THE EXPECTATIONS for the principalship are a number of school factors, including size and location, the nature of the faculty, and the aspirations of students. The duties and responsibilities of principals vary according to these factors. For instance, the principal in a small school in a rural area may have extensive responsibilities for student and community services that may be handled by other agencies in a more urban setting.

Principals responding to the survey instrument reported information about type of program, average daily attendance, expenditure per student for instruction, percent of dropouts and percent going to college, male/female ratio of teachers, and number and education of new teachers. Where appropriate, data are broken down by geographical region and size of community. Some data also are presented by public, parochial, religious affiliation, and private school classifications, as well.

Information was also sought on task priorities and educational issues. Surveyed in some depth was educational practice, including individual promotion, multiple diploma, use of educational technology, and teaching of basic skills. Priority of educational tasks is analyzed by a number of variables including sex and undergraduate background of the principal, per student expenditure level, region, and size of community. Types of state and federal programs receiving special funding are also reported. Comparisons with findings of the 1965 study are made when appropriate.

SCHOOL SIZE, LOCATION, AND TYPE

Table 43 reflects the dramatic increase in school size during the 12-year period 1965–1977 (see the last two columns of Table 43). In 1977, 23.8 percent of the high schools had enrollments of fewer than 500 students while in 1965, 65 percent of the schools enrolled fewer than 500 students. More than a third of the principals in 1977 reported that their school have enrollments of between 1,000 and 2,000 students, while in

TABLE 43
School Size by Region: 1977 with 1965

Region	Enrollment: Under 499	500-749	750-999	1000-1499	1500-1999	2000-2900	over 3000	% of Nation
New England								
% of region	20.8	12.9	7.9	32.7	15.8	7.9	2.0	
% of nation	1.8	1.2	.7	2.9	1.4	.7	.2	8.9
Mid Atlantic								
% of region	15.9	10.1	16.4	23.7	12.6	15.0	6.3	
% of nation	3.0	1.9	3.0	4.4	2.3	2.8	1.1	18.5
South								
% of region	15.4	19.1	14.2	24.7	13.6	11.1	1.8	
% of nation	2.2	2.8	2.0	3.6	2.0	1.6	.3	14.5
Midwest								
% of region	28.3	19.1	14.2	16.9	12.4	7.4	1.7	
% of nation	11.2	7.5	5.6	6.7	4.9	2.9	.7	39.5
Southwest								
% of region	25.0	14.6	5.2	18.8	18.8	15.6	2.1	
% of nation	2.1	1.2	.4	1.6	1.6	1.3	.2	8.4
Intermountain								
% of region	31.7	22.2	11.1	5.6	16.7	2.8	.0	
% of nation	1.4	.7	.4	.2	.5	.1	.0	3.3
West Coast								
% of region	29.2	12.5	8.3	18.1	22.2	5.6	4.2	
% of nation	1.7	.8	.5	1.2	1.4	.4	.3	6.5
Non-contiguous								
% of region	50.0	25.0	.0	.0	.0	25.0	.0	
% of nation	.2	.1	.0	.0	.0	.1	.0	.4
% by size enrollment	23.8	16.2	12.6	20.4	14.1	9.9	2.8	+99.0
1965 study	65.0	11.0	7.0	8.0	4.0	4.0	1.0	

1965 only 12 percent of the principals reported schools of this size. The number of schools with enrollments over 2,000 had more than doubled from five percent in 1965 to 12.7 percent in 1977. Apparently the increasing high school age population, school consolidations, and suburban expansion caused the shift toward larger schools.

The Intermountain and Midwest regions contain the most smaller schools. More than half (53.9 percent) of the high schools in the Intermountain region report enrollments of fewer than 750 students while in the Midwest slightly less than half (47.4 percent) have enrollments of fewer than 750 students. The regions having the highest percentages of large schools are Mid-Atlantic and the Southwest; 21.3 percent and 17.7 percent respectively have schools which enroll over 2,000 students.

Table 44 provides information about school size by type of school along with comparative percentages between the 1965 and 1977 studies. The comprehensive public high school remains the most common type, having about the same percentage (82.0 percent) as reported in 1965.

In the 1965 study principals were not requested to identify specialized or alternative public schools and, therefore, the 1965 figure of 82 percent might be a few percentage points higher than actually existed. Of the schools reported as under 500 in enrollment, 64.2 percent were public comprehensive which, if the sample is reasonably representative, comprises 15.8 percent of the schools in the nation. Of the schools reported as over 3,000 in enrollment, 96 percent are public comprehensive. They comprise 12.3 percent of the schools in the nation.

Data were not sought in the 1965 study about alternative public schools. They likely did not exist to any significant degree until 1969 or 1970. In 1977, 1.4 percent of the high schools in the nation were alternative public high schools and they made up 3.9 percent of high schools with enrollments under 500 students.

TABLE 44
School Size by Type

	Enrollment							
Type	*499 or less*	*500-749*	*750-999*	*1000-1499*	*1500-2999*	*over 3000*	*% of Nation*	*1965 Study*
Public Comprehensive								
% of size	64.2	76.9	81.8	89.2	94.3	96.0		
% of nation	15.8	12.4	10.4	18.3	13.3	12.3	82.5	82.0
Alternative								
% of size	3.9	.5	.7	.9	.0	.0		
% of nation	1.0	.1	.1	.2	.0	.0	1.4	
Specialized								
% of size	1.2	1.6	2.1	3.0	2.5	3.4		
% of nation	.3	.3	.3	.6	.4	.1	2.0	
Parochial								
% of size	8.0	11.5	5.6	4.3	2.5	.5		
% of nation	2.0	1.9	.7	.9	.4	.1	6.0	7.0
Private/religious affiliated								
% of size	14.0	9.3	9.8	1.7	.6	.0		
% of nation	3.9	1.5	1.2	.4	.1	.0	7.1	7.0
Private/non-religious								
% of size	4.1	.0	.0	.4	.0	.0		
% of nation	.8	.0	.0	.1	.0	.0	.9	3.0

Parochial high schools decreased slightly between 1965 and 1977, from seven percent to six percent of the sample. A figure this small could be accounted for by sampling error, however. Some parochial high schools are represented in every size category but they tend to enroll 750 or fewer students.

Private religious-affiliated high schools make up approximately seven percent of the high schools of the nation; this percentage is unchanged since the 1965 study. They are characteristically smaller, with 14 percent of all high schools of 500 or fewer being of this type.

Private non-religious high schools now make up only one percent of the schools of the nation and show a decline from three percent in 1965. It is highly unlikely that sampling error could account for this difference or that increased numbers in the other categories would

TABLE 45
Location of High Schools by Region According to Type

Region	*Compre.*	*Public Alt.*	*Spec.*	*Parochial*	*Private Religious*	*Pri/non-Religious*	*% of Nation*
New England							
% of type	69.6	.0	6.9	8.8	8.8	3.9	
% of nation	6.3	.0	.6	.8	.8	.4	8.9
Mid-Atlantic							
% of type	75.4	1.0	2.4	8.2	12.6	.5	
% of nation	13.8	.2	.4	1.5	2.3	.1	18.3
South							
% of type	85.9	3.7	2.5	3.1	1.8	1.8	
% of nation	12.4	.5	.4	.4	.3	.3	14.3
Midwest							
% of type	85.6	3.7	1.3	6.3	5.4	.4	
% of nation	33.8	.3	.5	2.5	2.1	.2	37.4
Southwest							
% of type	90.6	1.0	1.0	1.0	6.3	.0	
% of nation	7.7	.1	.1	.1	.5	.0	8.5
Intermountain							
% of type	94.4	2.8	.0	.0	2.8	.0	
% of nation	3.0	.1	.0	.0	.1	.1	3.2
West Coast							
% of type	10.0	2.8	.0	8.3	13.9	.0	
% of nation	4.8	.2	.0	.5	.9	.0	6.4
Non-contiguous							
% of type	66.7	.0	.0	.0	33.3	.0	
% of nation	.2	.0	.0	.0	.1	.0	.3
% by type	82.0	1.4	2.0	5.8	7.1	1.0	+99.0
1965 study	82.0	N.D.	N.D.	7.0	7.0	3.0	

alone have caused a decrease in the relative ratio indicated by a percentage statistic.

The Very Small and the Very Large High School

Data shown in the tables provided above could be further detailed to show the percentages by region and type for high schools of fewer than 250 students, 250 to 500 students, 3,000 to 4,000, and more than 4,000. These data are shown in Tables 46 and 47. For comparative purposes total percentages of high schools by size are shown from the 1965 study.

The largest percentages of high schools with enrollments under 250 students (Table 46) are found in the Midwest, Intermountain, West Coast, and non-contiguous states—8.3, 11.1, 11.1, and 50.0 percent,

TABLE 46
School Size: The Very Small and the Very Large by Region

	Size					
	Less than		*3,000-*	*More than*	*% of Nation*	
Region	*250*	*250-499*	*3,999*	*4,000*	*Small*	*Large*
New England						
% of region	6.9	13.9	1.0	1.0		
% of nation	.6	1.2	.1	.1	1.8	.2
Mid Atlantic						
% of region	5.3	10.6	3.4	2.9		
% of nation	1.0	2.0	.6	.5	3.0	1.0
South						
% of region	4.3	11.1	1.2	.6		
% of nation	.6	1.6	.2	.1	2.2	.3
Midwest						
% of region	8.3	20.0	1.3	.4		
% of nation	3.3	7.9	.5	.2	11.2	.7
Southwest						
% of region	7.3	17.7	2.1	.0		
% of nation	.6	1.5	.2	.0	2.1	.2
Intermountain						
% of region	11.1	30.6	.0	.0		
% of nation	.4	1.0	.0	.0	1.4	.0
West Coast						
% of region	11.1	18.1	2.8	1.4		
% of nation	.7	1.2	.2	.1	1.9	.3
Non-contiguous						
% of region	50.0	.0	.0	.0		
% of nation	.2	.0	.0	.0	.2	.0
Total of nation	7.4	16.4	1.8	1.0	23.8	2.8
Total % of nation 1965 study	43.0	22.0	1.0	1.0	65.0	1.0

TABLE 47
School Size: The Very Small and the Very Large, by Type

Type	Size: Less than 250	250-499	3,000-3,999	More than 4,000	% of Nation: Small	Large
Public						
Comprehensive						
% of type	58.8	59.6	95.0	100.0	15.8	2.7
% of nation	4.4	11.4	1.7	1.0		
Alternative						
% of type	3.5	4.3	.0	.0		
% of nation	.3	.7	.0	.0	1.0	.0
Specialized						
% of type	1.2	1.1	5.0	.0		
% of nation	.1	.2	.1	.0	.3	.1
Parochial						
% of type	4.5	10.3	.0	.0		
% of nation	.3	1.7	.0	.0	2.0	.0
Priv/religious						
% of type	25.0	13.0	.0	.0		
% of nation	1.8	2.1	.0	.0	3.9	.0
Priv/non-religious						
% of type	7.0	1.1	.0	.0		
% of nation	.6	.2	.0	.0	.8	.0
Total % of nation	7.5	17.3	1.8	1.0	23.8	2.8

respectively. Although small schools make up only a small percentage of the total high schools of the nation, they still represent a significant number, especially in the large Midwest region. All regions, except the non-contiguous states, where the sample may be spurious, show at least 10 percent of the high schools with enrollments between 250 and 500 students: Intermountain region, 30.6 percent; Midwest region, 21.0 percent; and Southwest, 17.7 percent.

In 1965, the percentage of high schools having enrollments under 205 students represented 43.0 percent of the nation compared to only 7.4 percent in 1977. The decline in percentage of high schools with enrollments between 250 and 500 students was from 22.0 percent in 1965 to 16.4 percent in 1977.

Again from Table 46, all regions, except the Intermountain and non-contiguous states, show significant numbers of high schools with enrollments over 3,000 students. These two regions, along with the Southwest, provided no schools in the sample with enrollments over 4,000 students. The total percentages of high schools in the nation indicate an increase in the very large schools of about three times the number from 1965 (1.0 percent) to 1977 (2.8 percent). Both the decline in percentage of the small high schools and the increase in large high

schools are statistically significant (beyond the .001 level) so that the magnitude of the change is a very real one.

Table 47 provides data about the very small and the very large high schools, by type. No data are available from 1965 by which to make comparisons. The table indicates the preponderance of the comprehensive high schools in each category by size: 58.8 percent of the high schools under 250 students; 69.6 percent with enrollments of 250 to 500; 95.0 percent with enrollments of 3,000 to 4,000; and 100.0 percent of 4,000 students or more. Of the public schools, almost all alternative and specialized high schools are small.

Parochial (0.3 percent) and private/religious affiliated (1.8 percent) high schools make up almost one-third of the high schools with enrollments under 250 students in the nation. Private/religious affiliated high schools represent 25.0 percent of all high schools with enrollments under 250 students. Parochial (10.3 percent) and private/religious affiliated (13.0 percent) together account for almost one-fourth of all high schools with enrollments between 250 and 500 students.

Distribution of Grade Levels in High Schools, 1977 and 1965

Table 48 contains the percentages of high schools according to grade level organization. Patterns employing grades 9-12 and 10-12 increased dramatically between 1965 and 1977, while all other types decreased. In 1977, the 9-12 grade pattern made up almost two-thirds (63.0 percent) of all high schools while the 10-12 pattern was represented in 26.0 percent of the high schools. This growth in the 9-12

TABLE 48
Distribution of Grade Levels in High Schools 1977, 1965

Grades	% 1977	% 1965
K-12	2.0	8.0
1-12	0.0	17.0
7-12	6.0	19.0
8-12	1.0	6.0
9-12	63.0	35.0
10-12	26.0	12.0
11-12	1.0	0.0
Other	1.0	1.0

grade level organization probably reflects in part the advent of middle schools during the past decade. The grade pattern 1-12 had all but disappeared by 1977.

Expenditures per Student 1965 and 1977

The rapid increase in per pupil expenditures between 1965 and 1977 is even more dramatic than the shift to larger high schools. In

1965, 67 percent of all high schools spent under $500 per student per year; in 1977, only three percent of the high schools of the nation spent under $500 per student. The magnitude of increase is over 30 times. Table 49 shows the distribution of percentages of high schools in the nation by level of expenditure. Approximately half (53 percent) of the high schools spent between $900 and $1,500 per student during 1977 while three percent of all high schools spent $2,400 or more per student per year.

TABLE 49
Expenditures per Student, 1977 and 1965

1977 Costs	*% of Schools*	*1965 Costs*	*% of Schools*
Less than $500	3.0	Less than $30.00	3.0
500 to 899	20.0	30 to 99	6.0
900 to 1,199	25.0	100 to 199	8.0
1,200 to 1,499	28.0	200 to 299	15.0
1,500 to 1,799	11.0	300 to 399	20.0
1,800 to 2,099	6.0	400 to 499	15.0
2,100 to 2,399	4.0	500 to 599	11.0
2,400 or more	3.0	600 to 699	6.0
		700 or more	7.0

In Table 50 percentages of high schools by level of expenditure are shown. The South (11 percent), the Southwest (six percent), and New England (five percent) have the highest percentages of high schools spending under $500 per student. The Mid-Atlantic (24 percent) Intermountain (14 percent), and New England (13 percent) have the

TABLE 50
High Schools by Region and Expenditure per Student, 1977

	Amount							
Region	*Less than $500*	*$500-$899*	*$900-$1,199*	*$1,200 $1,499*	*$1,500 $1,799*	*$1,800 $2,099*	*$2,100 $2,399*	*Over $2,400*
New England	5.0	7.0	27.0	32.0	14.0	5.0	6.0	2.0
Mid-Atlantic	3.0	19.0	17.0	23.0	14.0	9.0	9.0	6.0
South	11.0	39.0	32.0	11.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	0.0
Midwest	1.0	15.0	28.0	36.0	12.0	5.0	2.0	1.0
Southwest	5.0	34.0	28.0	20.0	7.0	4.0	0.0	1.0
Intermountain	0.0	33.0	25.0	21.0	7.0	6.0	4.0	4.0
West Coast	0.1	13.0	24.0	41.0	13.0	2.0	0.0	1.0
% of Total Sample	3.0	20.0	25.0	28.0	11.0	6.0	4.0	3.0

largest percentages of high expenditure high schools—more than $1,800 per student per year. The median range of expenditure per student per school is $1,200 or $1,500 per student.

Students and Staff

Data were also collected on both students and teachers. The information gathered about students includes average daily attendance, dropouts, and graduates entering college. Concerning the teachers, principals were asked about the number of new teachers, education of new teachers, and male/female ratios. Data relative to several of these variables were collected for the 1965 study so that comparisons can be provided.

Average Daily Attendance (ADA)

Since the number of students attending school in comparison to the number actually enrolled has become a rising concern recently, questions were asked about average daily attendance. Response data are shown in Table 51. Seventeen percent of all high school principals reported an ADA of 95 percent or more, and 72 percent reported an ADA of above 90 percent. Only one percent reported an ADA of 60 percent to 69 percent. Medical authorities consider a five percent absentee rate as normal for means of health.

TABLE 51
Average Daily Attendance by High Schools, 1977

% of ADA	% of Schools
Less than 59	0.0
60.0 to 69.9	1.0
70.0 to 79.9	5.0
80.0 to 89.9	21.0
90.0 to 94.9	55.0
95 or more	17.0

Percent of Dropouts

The dropout rate of students who enter the high school appears to have improved slightly from 1965 to 1977, although the change is not statistically significant except at two levels: less than 10 percent, and between 25 to 34.9 percent. In 1977, five percent of the principals reported no dropouts versus eight percent in 1965. The less than 10 percent absentee category in 1977 was 62 percent of all high schools while in 1965 some 54 percent reported the 10 percent absentee rate. See Table 52.

TABLE 52
Dropout Rate of
High Schools 1977, 1965

% of Dropouts	1977	1965
None	5.0	8.0
Less than 9.9	62.0	54.0
10 to 24.9	28.0	27.0
25 to 35.9	3.0	7.0
More than 36	2.0	3.0

If we consider the major efforts mounted by schools during the past decade to lower the dropout rate, the gains made appear to be modest.

Graduates Entering College

Principals were asked to report the percentage of graduates of the last graduating class that went on to college. Between 1965 and 1977 significant shifts occurred in the percent of high school graduates going on to college. The most significant shift occurs in the percentages of high schools with more than 40 percent of their graduates entering college. In 1977, 62 percent of the principals reported that more than 40 percent of their graduates entered college while in 1965, 37 percent of the principals reported that more than 40 percent of their graduates entered college.

TABLE 53
Last Graduating Class Entering College

% of High Schools	% of 1977 Graduates Entering College	% of 1965 Graduates Entering College
Less than 4.9	0.5	3.0
5.0 to 9.9	0.5	3.0
10.0 to 19.9	5.0	9.0
20.0 to 29.9	11.0	15.0
30.0 to 39.9	21.0	21.0
40.0 to 59.9	34.0	25.0
60.0 to 79.9	18.0	13.0
80.0 to 94.8	7.0	5.0
95.0 or more	3.0	4.0

41

Male/Female Teachers

The percentage of men and women teachers in the high schools as reported by the principals surveyed in 1965 and in 1977 is shown in Table 54. In 1977, fewer than three percent of the high schools had less

TABLE 54
Male/Female Ratios of High Schools, 1977 and 1965

Male	Female	% of High Schools 1977	1965
Less than 10.0%	More than 90.0%	3.0	7.0
10.0 to 19.9	81.0 to 90.9	3.0	3.0
20.0 to 29.9	71.0 to 89.9	4.0	4.0
30.0 to 39.9	61.0 to 70.9	10.0	8.0
40.0 to 49.9	51.0 to 60.9	16.0	14.0
50.0 to 59.9	41.0 to 50.9	29.0	21.0
60.0 to 69.9	31.0 to 40.9	24.0	21.0
70.0 to 79.9	21.0 to 30.9	7.0	11.0
80.0 or more	20.0 or less	4.0	11.0

than 10 percent men and more than 90 percent women teachers; in 1965, seven percent of the principals reported this ratio. At the other extreme, in 1977, four percent of the principals reported 80 percent or more men and 20 percent or less women teachers; in 1965, 11 percent of the principals reported this ratio. Both types of imbalance by sex, faculties heavily dominated either by men or women, declined significantly during the 12 years. Likewise, the growth of schools in which more than 50 percent but less than 69 percent of the faculty is male is significant, as is the decrease in schools with a percentage of males between 70 and 9.9 percent. There appears to be a significant total increase in male teachers, as we

Educational Levels of Teachers Employed Last Five Years 1977 and 1965

The educational levels of teachers employed during the five years previous to both the 1965 and 1977 surveys are shown in Table 55. A small but definite (and statistically significant) trend to teachers with a higher level of education is indicated for the period between the two surveys. This is shown by percentages of schools employing teachers

42

TABLE 55
Educational Levels of Teachers Employed Last Five Years— 1977 and 1965

	1977	1965
Bachelors degree or less	74.0	78.0
Masters degree	23.0	21.0
Masters, plus	3.0	1.0
Doctorate	0.0	0.0

with masters degrees (23 percent in 1977 versus 21 percent in 1965) and masters degrees plus additional preparation (three percent in 1977 versus one percent in 1965).

Full-time Teachers Employed in 1977

With declining enrollments hitting schools, a question was included concerning the employment of full-time teachers new to the district. Seventeen percent of high schools had no new full-time teachers, exclusive of transfers within the district in 1977, while 16 percent of the schools report six or more new teachers exclusive of transfers. (See Table 56.)

TABLE 56
New Full-Time Teachers Exclusive of Transfers by Percent of High Schools, 1977

Teachers	*High Schools, 1977*
None	17.0
1-2	29.0
3-4	27.0
5	10.0
6 or more	16.0

SUMMARY

- The human elements with which a principal works in a school have changed dramatically since 1965. The numbers of persons comprising a student body, their aspirations, their behavior, and their inclusive ages differ along a number of dimensions between 1965 and 1977. The faculty reflects interesting shifts in composition as well.
- Perhaps the most fundamental change has been school size. In the short space of 12 years the typical American high school has changed from an institution with *fewer* than 500 students to an institution of *more* than 750 students. This reflects an increase of at least 50 percent in the mean size of the high schools in the nation. Adding to this major shift is an equally dramatic growth in large schools of 2,000 or more students; they have doubled in number from 1965 to 1977.
- Size factors are fundamental in the management of any organization. Changes in size cause a ripple effect on communications, interpersonal relationships, leadership expectations, control procedures, and budget administration, for instance. To be successful in 1977, the principal must employ procedures effective in larger institutions, procedures perhaps unwarranted or unnecessary in the smaller school of

1965. In sum, the typical principalship required different professional skills in 1977 based on the single factor of shifts in school size. When the many other factors of change over the past decade are added to school size, the pervasive transformation of the job can be more clearly viewed.

■ The high school of 1977 is definitely a larger and more specialized institution than earlier models. The focus now is upon older students in grades nine to 12, with the grade seven to 12 pattern becoming significantly less common. The aspirations of students and the nature of the faculty also reflect some important changes, with a 50 percent increase in the number of graduates entering college and a definite move toward sex balance on the faculty. Many of these shifts occurred subtly, year by year, but taken in sum they create a new blueprint for the American high school.

4 Educational Purposes and Practices

MANY CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE principalship changed during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Concurrent with these fluid times, did the attitudes of principals about the tasks, priorities, and practices of high schools become reshaped as well? Did new perceptions about graduation requirements, student promotion, programs of study, and categorical funding develop during the period 1965–1977?

Principals were questioned about their beliefs on these matters. Their opinions on broad educational issues and upon specific educational practices are presented in this section of the study.

The Tasks of Secondary Schools

Principals in both the 1977 and 1965 surveys were asked to rank statements about the educational purposes of schools, with three statements added to the 1977 survey that were not included in 1965. The results of both surveys are shown in Table 57 with the list arranged according to rank by median scores of the total sample of principals.

TABLE 57
Ranking of Educational Tasks 1977 and 1965

Educational Task	*Rank* 1977	1965
Acquisition of basic skills (reading, writing, computing)	1	1
Development of positive self-concept (and good human relations)	2	7
Development of skills and practice of critical intellectual inquiry and problem solving	3	4
Development of moral and spiritual values	4	2
Career planning and training in specific entry level occupational skills	5	-
Knowledge about and skills in preparation for family life	6	-
Understanding of the American value system (political, economic, social)	7	3
Preparation for a changing world	8	5
Physical fitness and useful leisure time sports	9	6
Development of skills to operate a technological society (engineering, scientific)	10	8
Appreciation for and experience with the fine arts	11	-

The acquisition of basic skills had, and still has, first priority according to the 1965 and 1977 surveys. The most dramatic change concerns self-concept. The development of self-concept was given a much higher priority in 1977 than in 1965, going from seventh place in 1965 to second in 1977. Intellectual inquiry and problem solving as well as moral and spiritual values changed position slightly in the ranking. The lower priority given to moral education is somewhat surprising given the renewed emphasis in this field during the 1970s. The relative position of other statements in the list of priorities remained basically unchanged.

The ranking of tasks by responding principals in the 1977 survey was examined in view of the variables of age, sex, undergraduate major, expenditure per pupil, and population of the communities of the principals reporting. In all cases there was no significant change in ranking when principals of parochial and religious-affiliated schools were withdrawn from the sample.

On the variable of sex, almost half the women respondents representing a religious affiliation ranked moral and spiritual values first and placed basic skills in fourth place. The same result occurred on the variable of salary—when principals of religious affiliated schools were left in the sample, principals in the lowest salary category ranked moral and spiritual values first.

Opinions About Broad Educational Issues

In Table 58 the list of broad educational issues presented to principals is given along with responses of the total sample of principals. Nineteen issues were presented, 14 of which were used in the 1965 survey. Principals in 1977 were asked to select one of four responses: agree without reservation, agree with some reservation, agree with many reservations, do not agree. The first two responses are classified as agree; the second two as disagree. A statistical test (standard error of

TABLE 58
Principals' Beliefs About Broad Educational Issues
1977 and 1965

Item	1977		1965	
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
The principle of *universal* secondary education is essential to American society.	81	19	76	24
Federal aid must be made available to private and religious secondary schools.	29	71	19	81
Court decisions concerning compulsory prayer and Bible reading are correct as they apply to public schools.	48	52	36	64

TABLE 58 (cont.)

Item	1977 Agree	1977 Disagree	1965 Agree	1965 Disagree
Court decisions concerning racial segregation are correct as they apply to public schools.	49	51	75	25
Certain limitations should be placed upon classroom discussions of political "isms" and "anti-isms."	39	61	24	76
Schools require far too little academic work of students. Note: Base your response to this item only with reference to the school of which you are now principal.	56	44	16	84
The U.S. is not producing enough doctors and research scholars in the fields of human needs such as energy, environment, etc.	63	37	22	78
There is a need to justify as practical each subject taught in secondary schools.	39	61	24	76
Grouping according to IQ or achievement scores is desirable in academic subjects such as math, English, and foreign languages.	53	47	82	18
The academic year (compulsory) should be lengthened.	12	88	22	78
Youth who are disinterested or hostile toward schooling should *not* be required to attend.	59	41	34	66
School attendance should be compulsory until high school graduation, or age 18	15	85	39	71
Schools should provide a general intellectual background and leave specific job training to other agencies	10	90	67	33
High schools should develop special programs for educating the academically talented students.	92	8	19	81
The United States is not producing enough skilled technicians and "middle" level technical/managerial people.	62	38	NA	NA
High schools should design special programs for the handicapped, ethnic minority, and non-English speaking.	75	25	NA	NA
Equal treatment of the sexes, as embodied in Title IX guidelines, is a positive development in secondary schools.	68	32	NA	NA
Student rights in matters of due process, as being interpreted by the courts, is a necessary development in secondary schools.	54	46	NA	NA
Legislation and court decisions regarding confidentiality of records of students and staff is a necessary development in secondary schools.	62	38	NA	NA
High schools should not undertake major curriculum changes without first securing community support.	74	26	NA	NA

proportions) showed significant differences between the responses of principals in 1977 and 1965 on *all* items at more than the .01 level. Principals in 1977 evidently hold very different beliefs than did principals in 1965 on every issue included in both surveys. This dramatic shift in attitudes concerning broad educational issues is probably the most striking outcome of the study.

Opinions About Educational Practices

On a more specific level, a series of questions was asked of principals about educational practices. The responses, in some instances, differ from 1965.

Principals were asked whether they "favor the idea of a multiple diploma or diploma and certificate plan for students who fail to achieve a minimum mastery of certain basic subjects." Sixty percent of the principals favored such a plan without reservations, with seven percent indicating they now use this approach. Because the response categories for the 1977 and 1965 surveys are different, each set is provided separately in Table 59.

TABLE 59
"Do You Favor a Multiple Diploma," 1977 and 1965

Response	*1977*	*Response*	*1965*
Yes	53	In general, approve	64*-76*
Yes, we have such a system	7	In general, disapprove	21-33
Some advantages, some disadvantages	23	No opinion	2-3
No	16	*Responses are the range between rural and urban principals	
No opinion	1		

The question, "Do you favor individual promotion for students rather than customary grade placement and continuous promotion?" was included in both studies. Fewer principals in 1977 responded affirmatively than in 1965: 42 percent in 1977 versus approximately 55 percent in 1965 when the mean is computed from the two types of "yes" responses. Far fewer definite "no" responses were given in 1977. However, a category of "some advantages, some disadvantages," was provided principals in the 1977 study which was not provided in 1965. (See Table 60.)

Principals were asked whether "technological advances, such as television, computer-assisted instruction, etc., hold real promise for improving the quality of education." The responses, "yes, considerable promise," and "yes, some promise," when combined, are almost unchanged between the 1977 and 1965 surveys. The "no, little if any promise," and, "no, would be harmful," percentage significantly

TABLE 60
"Do You Favor Individual Promotion," 1977 and 1965

Response	*1977*	*1965*
Yes	37	48-51
Yes, have such a system	5	3-7
Some advantages, some disadvantages	47	Not on questionnaire
No	9	35-36
No opinion	3	9-10

increased in 1977, however. This change is caused by a shift from the "no opinion" responses. (See Table 61.)

TABLE 61
Technological Advances as Promise for Improving Quality of Education 1977 and 1965

Response	*1977*	*1965*
Yes, considerable and yes, some	69	68-71
No, little promise or no, harmful	29	15-17
No opinion	2	13-15

Principals commented on whether they "favor some rigorous checks of attainment of basic skills (e.g., competency testing) for graduation." Fifty-nine percent of the principals indicated they favored such monitoring, with eight percent indicating that they now have such a system. Less than one percent indicated no opinion, and six percent gave a "no" response. No data were obtained concerning this practice in the 1965 survey.

"What is the optimum number of students for a comprehensive high school?" Principals responding to this question in 1977 appeared to

TABLE 62
Responses to Opinion of Checks on Basic Skills, 1977

Response	*1977*
Yes	51%
Yes, we have such a system	8%
Some advantages, some disadvantages	36%
No	6%
No opinion	0%

favor schools of 1,500 or smaller, for the most part. Some concerns about schools of over 2,000 enrollment appear to be developing as only four percent of the 1977 principals consider this to be the optimum size. This is a small but significant shift since 1965 against large schools when two factors are considered: (1) the growth generally in school size since 1965; and, (2) the tendency for principals to consider as favorable the present size of their schools.

Data from the 1965 study are listed by small, medium, and large high school principals. This classification is not provided for the 1977 survey because the enrollment categories used for small, medium, and large schools are not comparable. However, no principal of a large high school in 1977 (over 2,500 students) indicated that size as optimum, and almost all principals (seven percent) who favored high schools under 500 students were principals of schools of that size. In the 1977 survey, 74 percent of the principals favored a high school of 500 to 1,500 students; in 1965, more than half (51 percent) of the large high school principals favored schools of that size.

TABLE 63
Optimum Size for a Comprehensive High School
1977 and 1965

School Size	1977	1965 Small	1965 Medium	1965 Large
Less than 500	7	26	4	0
500 to 900	32	40	52	7
1000 to 1499	42	17	28	44
1500 to 1999	15	4	6	37
2000 to 2499	4	1	1	9
2500 to 2999	0	0	1	3
3000 or above	0	0	0	0

Principals of 78 percent of the high schools report summer school as the most frequent alternative experience for earned credit toward graduation, followed by "night, adult, or correspondence courses" (61 percent), "off-campus work or on-the-job training" (61.1 percent), and "credit by contract and independent study" (54.6 percent).

Data regarding state and federally funded programs are presented in Table 65. Vocational education (74 percent), special education (68 percent), Title IV—Instructional (67 percent), and Title I—ESEA (62 percent), led all areas in the percentage of funded programs reported by principals. They were the only programs reported by more than one-third of the principals.

TABLE 64
Alternative Experiences for which Students May Earn Graduation Credit, 1977

Type of Experience	*% of Schools*
Summer	78
Night, adult, or correspondence course	61
Off-campus work or on-the-job training	61
Credit by contract and independent study	54
College courses taught at college	45
College level courses taught in high school	23
Credit by examination	17
Community volunteer programs	17
Other	4

TABLE 65
State and Federally Funded Programs, 1977

Program	*% of Schools*
Vocational Education	74
Special Education	68
Federal, Title IV—Instructional	67
Federal, Title I—ESEA	62
Career Education	33
Federal, Title III—Innovative	31
State Compensatory Education	21
Impact Aid	15
Bilingual	11
Indo-Chinese Refugee Assistance	7
Desegregation (Emergency Aid)	6
Other	4

Summary

■ The principalship continues to undergo significant changes from a number of perspectives, ranging from the singular matter of school size to more complex questions of purpose. This change is evidenced by tremendous shifts in belief patterns, in priority of tasks, and in views about issues and practices. The principal's job has become more complex as well. Increased school size, a broader range of programs, higher expenditure levels, and the advanced training of teachers all contribute to this complexity. Also, today's principal takes a more critical view of research, large school size, available technology, and the academic preparation of students than his predecessor took.

5 Parent and Community Relationships

PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT has become a central theme in school administration in recent years. Federal and state programs often require that local districts develop plans and procedures for community involvement. In addition, the movement toward needs assessment, program budgeting, and annual school plans has increased school-parent contacts appreciably.

For this reason, it is important to consider the types of communities in which high schools are located. Table 66 shows the distribution

TABLE 66
Community Types Represented in the Study

City, more than 1,000,000	6
City, 150,000-999,999	8
Suburban, related to city of 150,000 or more	21
City, 25,000-149,999 population distinct from a metropolitan area	16
City, 5,000-24,999 not suburban	20
Town or rural, under 4,999	28

of high schools across various community categories. Forty-eight percent of the high school principalships today are in cities or towns of 25,000 population or less. Community involvement is, to a degree, conditioned by this dominance of smaller towns. It should be noted, however, that in 1965 some 55 percent of all high school principals worked in towns or rural areas with 5,000 or less population. The ways principals evaluate the attitudes of parents/citizens and students about participation are summarized in Table 67.

More than one-third of the principals observed an increase in the willingness of students and parents to participate during the last year. This response is tempered by two other findings. First, one-half of the principals observed no change in willingness of parents to participate; and second, as reported in Chapter 3, 78 percent of the principals re-

TABLE 67
Principals' Opinions of Willingness of Parents and Students To Participate in School

	More Willing to Participate	*Less Willing to Participate*	*Some Degree of Willingness to Participate*	*No Opinion*
Parents	36	11	51	1
Students	41	19	39	0

ported apathetic or irresponsible parents had been roadblocks to successful administration of schools.

When asked about the areas in which parents or citizens were involved during the past year, principals said they fell into two classifications: planning-advisory capacity and school operations. In Table 68 the areas of involvement are rank ordered in each classification according to the frequency of response.

TABLE 68
Areas of Involvement of Parents or Citizens in the School

In a Planning-Advisory Capacity	*Rank*	*In the Operation of the School*	*Rank*
Student activities	1	Resource persons to programs & activities	1
Objectives & priorities for the school	2	Operators of concessions for the benefit of the school	2
Finance & fund raising	3	Sponsors or advisers of student groups	3
Program changes & new programs being considered	4	Monitors, supervisors, ticket sellers of student activities	4
Student behavior, rights & responsibilities	5	Aides (volunteer)	5
Evaluation of programs	6	Tutors (volunteer)	6
General administration	7	Advisers, counselors to individual students	7
Evaluation of personnel	8		

More than 50 percent of the principals reported parent involvement in the areas ranked one through five under Planning-Advisory Capacity. Seventy percent of the principals reported parent/community involvement in student activities, the number one ranked area. Considerably fewer of the principals reported involvement of the community in the areas ranked six, seven, and eight. Thirty-five percent reported citizens involved in the evaluation of programs; 14 percent

reported involvement of citizens in general administration; and five percent had used citizens in the evaluation of personnel.

Under the operation of the school only the areas ranked first and second were reported by more than 50 percent of the principals. The lowest ranked area, advisers, counselors to students, was reported by 13 percent of the principals.

The findings reported in Table 68 reflect parent/citizen involvement in cooperative/constructive roles in school-planned areas of interest. In addition, principals were surveyed relative to the involvement of various publics in constraining principals in meeting their responsibilities. They were asked to estimate the degree to which they may be constrained by activities of the following publics: the federal government, the state government, the local district school board and central office, the specific community served by their schools, and groups within their schools. Table 69 contains the results of those estimations.

In general, these findings reveal that principals anticipate greater potential constraints coming from their local community and in-school publics than they do more external publics; i.e., federal factors, state factors, and district office factors. In terms of the specific potential constraints some interesting points may be made:

- An overwhelming majority of principals estimated desegregation/busing would not exercise any constraint on their schools. This was seen by principals as the least constraining of all factors surveyed.
- Federal legislation requiring that schools not discriminate on the basis of sex, Title IX, and federal legislation ensuring the substantive and procedural due process rights of students were estimated as the most constraining federal factors.
- Principals did not estimate that any state factors would exercise a great deal of constraint. The most constraining state factor was the practice of categorical funding for specific areas of student need.
- In terms of local school boards, principals estimated the greatest constraint to be in restrictive policies.
- Principals estimate that the major constraint in the local community is parents' lack of interest. Seventy-nine percent of the principals estimated that this factor would exercise some constraint on successful administration of schools. In terms of all factors surveyed, parents' lack of interest was the second most frequently estimated constraint.
- On all three student factors (absenteeism, lack of motivation, discipline), at least 74 percent of the principals estimated some degree of constraint. Student lack of motivation was the most frequently estimated constraint, 90 percent.

TABLE 69
Constraints of the Principal in Fulfilling Responsibilities of His Job

Source	*Factor*	*Not a Constraint*	*Minor Constraint*	*Major Constraint*
Federal Regulations	Desegregation/busing	85	8	6
	Title IX	39	48	12
	Student rights	38	51	11
	Categorical funds (Title I, programs, etc.)	53	37	10
State Requirements	Compulsory attendance	42	42	16
	Graduation requirements	58	35	7
	Curriculum and textbooks	60	36	4
	Accountability	55	38	6
	Categorical funds (Special education)	47	39	13
Central Office/ School Board	Policy restrictions	38	52	11
	Lack of support	56	31	13
	Interference	49	37	13
Community	Pressures of special interest groups	47	45	8
	Parents' lack of interest	21	51	28
	Parental demands	39	54	7
Within School	Student absenteeism	25	48	27
	Student lack of motivation	10	57	33
	Discipline problems	26	63	11
	Teacher contract specifications	41	43	16
	Teacher unprofessionalism	26	58	16

- Nearly three in every four principals estimated that teachers' unprofessional behavior would be a constraint. This concern with teacher behavior and performance is consistent with the finding reported in Chapter 4, that 84 percent of the principals reported variations in teacher ability as a roadblock to school success.

Community education and alternative education programs have become popular ideas in the last few years. Principals' estimates of the percentage of their total enrollment involved in programs of this nature appears in Table 70.

In most part the table is self-explanatory. Note, however, that principals report the most extensive enrollments in programs which

TABLE 70
Percentage of Enrollment Participating in Programs

Programs	*0-5%*	*6-10%*	*11-15%*	*More than 15%*
Job experience programs	52	30	10	8
Separate vocational education center	70	15	8	7
Community service for credit	92	5	1	2
Released time, for work without credit	75	14	5	6
"Alternative school" within this school	96	3	1	0
"Alternative school" not in this school	98	2	0	0
Released time for religious instruction	98	0	0	2

have a work or vocational emphasis. It seems that job experience programs provide a major avenue for involving the schools in the community.

Summary

- Principalships are most often found in small communities or towns. However, there has been a substantial decrease since 1965 in the percentage of principals employed in towns with 5,000 or less population.
- There is reason to be cautiously optimistic about an increasing willingness of parents and students to participate in school activities. Parents and citizens are frequently used in a planning-advisory capacity in high schools, particularly in the area of student activities. Very few principals, however, involve parents or citizens in the evaluation of personnel.
- The local community, students, and teachers are viewed as potentially much more constraining to principals than are the federal government, state government, or the district central office.
- Lack of interest by parents, lack of motivation in students, and unprofessional behavior of teachers are estimated to be the major community constraints to the principal's performance.
- Job-related alternative or community programs are reported by principals as the most popular options or additions to the regular school programs.

6 The High School Principal and the Future

THIS REPORT HAS BEEN CONCERNED primarily with a description of the principalship present and past. This final chapter focuses on the principalship and the future by describing how principals responded to the survey instrument's list of 17 conditions or developments which may seriously influence the American high school in the next three to five years.

Principals were asked to rate each item relative to its potential influence on their schools. To facilitate discussion of the results, the 17 items have been organized into three categories: factors external to schools, special interest factors, and school factors. Table 71 displays the findings on principals' projections of the future influence of external factors.

TABLE 71
Factors External to Schools, 1977

Factors	*No Influence*	*Some Influence*	*Strong Influence*
Enrollment decline	25	37	37
National youth service	67	31	1
Desegregation	66	25	9
Finance and general economy	3	28	69
New technology	13	77	11

Nearly all principals identify finance and the general economy as a future influence. Knowing the devastation of continuing inflation and how it affects school expenditures, principals may well anticipate reaching the saturation point of the public's willingness and ability to pay. Such speculation seems supported by the fact that nearly 70 percent of the principals recorded economic factors as strong future influence. Most likely related to the projected influence of monetary

matters on education is the concern for the future influence of declining school enrollment mentioned by 74 percent of the principals. The potential impact on schools of the combined factors of rising educational costs and decreasing numbers of students looms large in the minds of principals.

A surprise to the research team was that nearly two-thirds of the principals projected desegregation to be a non-influential factor for high schools in the near future. Why principals offer this evaluation is not apparent, but it seems fair to suggest that during the 1970s, major changes occurred in factors that will influence the schools. This projection was pursued to an analysis on a regional basis.

Table 72 reports by region principals' estimates of the future influence of desegregation. Principals in the South and Southwest substantially differ in their estimates from principals in other regions. One might conclude that the much greater anticipation of influence simply reflects the fact that these two regions have large ethnic minority populations.

TABLE 72
Influence of Desegregation by Region

Region	*No Influence*	*Some Influence*	*Strong Influence*
New England	70	26	4
Mid-Atlantic	70	23	7
South	46	40	14
Midwest	70	21	9
Southwest	58	38	4
Intermountain	81	14	5
West Coast	71	17	12
Total Sample	66	25	9

Such a conclusion may make some sense for the South and Southwest, but it does not account for the fact that most of the other regions have large minority populations as well. In light of the many dilemmas ethnic minorities face in urban situations, it is most interesting that 70 percent of the principals in the Northeast, Mid-Atlantic, Midwest, and West Coast regions did not project a major impact upon their schools caused by desegregation.

Table 73 shows principals' views of the future influence of special interest factors. This table highlights the belief of half of the principals that "strong influence" from interest groups demanding improved

TABLE 73
Influence of Special Interest Factors

Special Interest Factors	*No Influence*	*Some Influence*	*Strong Influence*
Alternative schools	40	48	12
Demand for basics	5	45	50
Community-based learning	34	59	7
Accountability	7	60	34
Community participation	11	73	15

student performance in the basics will be exerted upon schools. The strength of principals' projections for the back-to-basics movement is increased by the fact that 95 percent estimate that such demands will exert at least some influence in the near future. This estimated potential for pressure by the basics is most likely related to 96 percent of the principals projecting an influence on behalf of accountability.

Of interest is that 88 percent of the principals anticipate community participants to be an influence on their schools. The estimated impact of alternative schools and community-based learning, lowest of the special interest factors, suggests that parent/citizen involvement may have more influence than special student programs.

One might speculate on the basis of these findings that high schools will be influenced considerably in the next three to five years by specific special interests. Such a conclusion rests on the fact that of all factors at least 60 percent of the principals perceived some future influence in the three main interest areas identified in the study.

It appears, based upon principals' responses, that certain school factors will also significantly impact on high schools in the near future. Table 74 shows principals' projections of influence on selected school factors.

The large percentage of principals indicating strong or some influence by staff competency, graduation requirements, and competency testing of students probably reflects a more generalized concern, i.e., the accountability movement will maintain its momentum over the next five years to influence schools and principals. In the light of a high current interest in testing students for competency and/or graduation requirements the issue of staff competence would presumably become more and more influential. This projection of influence for these three related factors adds emphasis to the finding, reported in Chapter 3, that incompetent teachers are viewed as a major roadblock to administrative success.

Assuming the relationship among these three factors, one can also suggest that the anticipated influence of declining achievement fits into

TABLE 74
Influence of School Factors

School Factors	No Influence	Some Influence	Strong Influence
Student non-attendance	24	53	24
Declining achievement	12	58	30
Drug use	11	77	12
Staff competency	6	48	46
Competency testing of student	5	45	50
Graduation requirements	10	55	35
Lower compulsory attendance age	40	46	14

the general concern over accountability. This theme of interpretation, that principals expect accountability to exert considerable influence in the near future, is strengthened by the finding, reported earlier, that 50 percent of the principals anticipate strong influence by demands for the basics. To the extent that principals' estimates of influence permit a forecast of future activities, the findings on school factors indicate that in the next three to five years principals will spend a great deal of their time addressing demands for school accountability as represented by student achievement.

General Implications for the Future

This study of the principalship exhibits two major values: First, it allows for a careful, quantitative description of the nation's principals; and, second, it helps identify the major issues and questions which will face principals in the future.

In final comments, questions have been constructed from the findings of this study. The items posed do not pretend to be inclusive of all important matters, but rather suggestive of potential uses of the study for matters of inquiry, policy, and practice.

Personal and Career Issues

A. Findings on the under-representation of ethnic minorities and women in the principalship point to an undesirable state of affairs. Considering that the federal government, national organizations of all kinds, local associations, and universities have vigorously supported the recruitment, training, and employment of minorities and women in the principalship, the cause of the under-representation must be sought elsewhere. Given this, it seems paramount that the employment and career development practices of local school districts be examined thoroughly. Such examination would

yield information on the factors which have restricted the employment of women and minorities in the principalship.

B. Several questions relative to the career routes of principals could be explored with profit. Among these would be the following:

What is the most desirable type of formal education for a principal? Should the principalship be conceived as a summit career post with very specialized training, or should it be seen as one level of a career in educational administration? Is the principalship the appropriate training ground for the superintendency? Does the current demand for specific job-related training have positive or negative long-range implications? Can a person employed as a principal in his mid-thirties be successful for 30 years as the principal of one or two high schools?

Issues on the Nature of the Principalship

A. The nature of the high school has dramatically changed in the past 12 years. Two of the most dramatic changes have been the increase in expenditures and programs and the increase in school size. If these patterns continue some basic issues will need to be addressed. Illustrative of these would be: (1) Does the trend toward larger schools imply different formal and on-the-job training? (2) With substantial increases in programs and funding will principals need more authority and control in program and budget matters to be effective? and (3) What administrative competencies will be required with larger schools, more programs, greater public demands for accountability, and serious shortcomings in faculty competence?

B. Certain questions and issues which will directly impact on the nature of the school will seemingly influence the future of the principalship. One of the key concerns must focus on school size. At what point does the cost-benefit advantage of larger schools become a threat to educational quality and administrative effectiveness? Do larger schools reduce the human element in schools to the point where principals and faculty become simply technocrats and managers of technocrats? What variables should be considered beyond cost effectiveness and efficiency in considering the most desirable school size?

Job Condition Issues

A. The substantial increase in size, expenditure, programs, and community responsibilities forces the question of adequate administrative assistance for principals; that is, what is an adequate number of assistant principals? Directly related is the question of

expertise. Should assistant principals be specialists trained to manage specific administrative tasks, or should they be administrative generalists? Do models for most effective use of assistants exist? Can such models be developed and tested?

B. The findings on principals' salaries raise issues relative to the adequacy of compensation for the level of professional expectation. A fundamental question is whether the increases in salary, with control for general economic inflation, have paralleled the increased responsibilities and demands of the job. Will it be necessary in the future to increase salaries dramatically so that competent persons can be attracted to and maintained in the job? Should the development of principals' salaries be based upon comparisons with similar positions in the private sector?

C. Several implications for principals can be obtained from the finding about the amount of time principals spend on their jobs and how they spend their time. For instance, how many hours per week can a principal work and maintain top-level effectiveness? What can be done to resolve the most troublesome aspects of the job, lack of time and too much time spent on administrative detail?

D. A final issue which grows out of our findings may be of critical concern for principals in the near future. It has to do with the most desirable process for establishing salaries and benefits for principals. Will principals best be served by forming strong associations or unions and engaging in collective negotiations? Is the union/bargaining model unacceptable or acceptable in a professional field? What is the relationship of the principal to his employing district? Is the principal part of management or part of labor? What constraints and obligations would this kind of organizing place on principals?

Community Issues

A. Several future problems may be identified from the study's findings, such as responding to the demands of Title IX. However, the most important issues would seem to be reducing parent apathy and increasing student motivation. With the demands for accountability principals will have a serious need to discover effective strategies for accomplishing useful parent involvement. Secondly, they will need models for using this involvement to motivate student performance. As noted earlier, few people disagree with the desirability of parent involvement, but equally few people have answers for how to achieve it. Principals and those who advise them will need such answers in the future.

Summary

- The questions proposed in the chapter lead to one basic point: The nature of the high school, in terms of almost every factor, has changed substantially in the last 12 years. Given the nature of that change, the time, responsibility, and expertise expected of the principal has increased substantially.
- This leads to a basic conclusion of the study; that the principalship needs to be redefined if it is to retain a significant viability. A redefinition needs to be undertaken on both conceptual and operational grounds. Such an undertaking should be identified as a major priority of the professional field since the nature of the principalship and those who fill this role will, to a large extent, determine the character of secondary education in the future.

Appendix

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
Reston, Virginia 22091

NATIONAL STUDY OF THE HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP
Supported by the Rockefeller Family Fund

Directions

Your questionnaire is identified by the label placed on it. It is not necessary to sign or place your name on the questionnaire. In reporting results, only statistical summaries of the responses of groups of principals will be cited. In no case will the identity of an individual be divulged. You are urged to make every answer a sincere one.

Mark your answers on the questionnaire using pen or pencil. If you change a response please make the change distinctly so there is no doubt about how you wish to answer.

Attempt to answer every question. For some questions none of the alternatives may correspond exactly to your situation or to the opinion you hold. In such cases mark the alternative which comes closest to the answer you would like to give.

Place your completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and mail it. Thank you for your cooperation and your assistance in this important survey.

1. What is your sex? a. ☐ Male b. ☐ Female

2. What is your age?
   a. ☐ 23 or under
   b. ☐ 24-29
   c. ☐ 30-34
   d. ☐ 35-39
   e. ☐ 40-44
   f. ☐ 45-49
   g. ☐ 50-54
   h. ☐ 55-59
   i. ☐ 60 or older

3. With what ethnic group would you identify yourself?
   a. ☐ White
   b. ☐ Black
   c. ☐ Chicano/Hispanic
   d. ☐ American Indian
   e. ☐ Asian
   f. ☐ Other, specify _____

4. At what age were you appointed to your first principalship?
   a. ☐ Under 20
   b. ☐ 20-24
   c. ☐ 25-29
   d. ☐ 30-34
   e. ☐ 35-39
   f. ☐ 40-44
   g. ☐ 45-49
   h. ☐ 50-54
   i. ☐ 55 or older

65

Steering Committee for the Study of the Principalship: Lloyd E. McCleary, University of Utah; Richard A. Gorton, University of Wisconsin; Judith S. Greene, Miami Edison Senior H.S.; Brother Eagan Hunter, Notre Dame H.S.; Henry L. Miller, New Jersey ASSP; Eugene R. Smoley, Northwood H.S.; Scott D. Thomson, NASSP.

5. How many principalships have you held including your present one?

a. ☐ One
b. ☐ Two
c. ☐ Three
d. ☐ Four
e. ☐ Five
f. ☐ Six
g. ☐ Seven
h. ☐ Eight or more

6. How many years have you served as a principal?

a. ☐ One year
b. ☐ 2 or 3 years
c. ☐ 4 or 5 years
d. ☐ 6 or 7 years
e. ☐ 8 or 9 years
f. ☐ 10 to 14 years
g. ☐ 15 to 19 years
h. ☐ 20 to 24 years
i. ☐ 25 or more

7. How long have you been principal of this school?

a. ☐ Less than one year
b. ☐ One year
c. ☐ Two years
d. ☐ Three years
e. ☐ 4-5 years
f. ☐ 6-8 years
g. ☐ 9-11 years
h. ☐ 12-14 years
i. ☐ 15 years or more

8. What is the highest earned degree you hold?

a. ☐ Less than BA
b. ☐ Bachelor's degree
c. ☐ Master's degree in education
d. ☐ Master's degree not in ed.
e. ☐ Master's degree plus some additional graduate work
f. ☐ Master's degree plus all course work for a doctoral degree
g. ☐ Specialist degree
h. ☐ Doctor of Education or Philosophy
i. ☐ Some other degree, specify _____

9. In which of the following areas did you major as an undergraduate? If you majored in more than one, choose the one with the most hours. Select only one.

a. ☐ Business
b. ☐ Education (other than phys. ed.)
c. ☐ Fine arts
d. ☐ Humanities (e.g., literature, languages, etc.)
e. ☐ Physical education
f. ☐ Physical or biological sciences
g. ☐ Social sciences (e.g., sociology, history, etc.)
h. ☐ Other, specify _____

10. What is your major field of graduate study? Choose only one.

a. ☐ Educational administration and supervision
b. ☐ Secondary education
c. ☐ Physical education
d. ☐ Some other educational specialty, specify _____
e. ☐ Humanities or fine arts
f. ☐ Science or engineering
g. ☐ Business
h. ☐ Other, specify _____
i. ☐ No graduate study

11. How many years of teaching experience did you have prior to taking your present position? Do not include years as full-time administrator or supervisor.

a. ☐ none
b. ☐ 1 year
c. ☐ 2-3 years
d. ☐ 4-6 years
e. ☐ 7-9 years
f. ☐ 10-14 years
g. ☐ 15-19 years
h. ☐ 20-24 years
i. ☐ 25 years or more

12. In which of the following kinds of positions have you had one full year or more of experience? Place a check mark in one of the three columns after each response below which corresponds to your kinds of experiences.

Position	One-two years	Three-five years	More than five years
a. Elementary school principal	□	□	□
b. Junior or middle school assistant principal or principal	□	□	□
c. College administrator or instructor	□	□	□
d. Counselor, other guidance work	□	□	□
e. Secondary school dean, registrar	□	□	□
f. High school assistant principal	□	□	□
g. Athletic coach or director	□	□	□
h. Other administrative service, specify _____	□	□	□

13. On the average, how many hours a week do you work at your job as principal?

a. □ Less than 40
b. □ 40-44
c. □ 45-49
d. □ 50-54
e. □ 55-59
f. □ 60 or more

14. What is your annual salary as principal for the 1976-77 school year?

a. □ Under $12,000
b. □ $12,000-$15,999
c. □ $16,000-$19,999
d. □ $20,000-$23,999
e. □ $24,000-$27,999
f. □ $28,000-$31,999
g. □ $32,000-$34,999
h. □ $35,000 or more
i. □ Does not apply (religious order)

15. Which of the following categories best describes the high school of which you are principal? Choose only one answer.

a. □ Public comprehensive
b. □ Public "alternative"
c. □ Public special (commercial, vocational, arts, etc.)
d. □ Parochial or diocesan
e. □ Private, religious affiliated
f. □ Private, not religious affiliated
g. □ Other, specify _____

16. What grades are included in your school?

a. □ Kindergarten-12
b. □ 1-12
c. □ 7-12
d. □ 8-12
e. □ 9-12
f. □ 10-12
g. □ 11-12
h. □ Other, specify _____

17. How many high school students were enrolled in your school at the close of the 1976-77 school year?

a. □ Fewer than 250
b. □ 250-499
c. □ 500-749
d. □ 750-999
e. □ 1,000-1,499
f. □ 1,500-1,999
g. □ 2,000-2,999
h. □ 3,000-3,999
i. □ 4,000 or more

18. In which geographical region is your high school located?

a. ☐ New England
b. ☐ Mid-Atlantic
c. ☐ South
d. ☐ Midwest
e. ☐ Southwest
f. ☐ Inter Mountain
g. ☐ West Coast
h. ☐ Non-contiguous
i. ☐ Other, specify _____

19. What was the average per-student expenditure (exclusive of capital outlay) for each high school student in your school during the 1976-77 school year?

a. ☐ Less than $500
b. ☐ $500-$899
c. ☐ $900-$1,199
d. ☐ $1,200-$1,499
e. ☐ $1,500-$1,799
f. ☐ $1,800-$2,099
g. ☐ $2,100-$2,399
h. ☐ $2,400 or more

20. Which of the population categories best describes the locality of the high school of which you are principal?

a. ☐ City, more than 1,000,000
b. ☐ City, 150,000-999,999
c. ☐ Suburban, related to city of 150,000 population or more
d. ☐ City 25,000-149,999 population distinct from a metropolitan area
e. ☐ City, 5,000-24,999, not suburban
f. ☐ Town or rural under 4,999

21. What is the number of full time equivalent (F.T.E.) administrators (assistant principals, dean, activity director, hall principal, guidance director, etc.) assigned to your school? Do not count yourself. Check below using response to the nearest half.

a. ☐ Less than 1.5
b. ☐ 1.5 to 1.9
c. ☐ 2.0 to 2.4
d. ☐ 2.5 to 2.9
e. ☐ 3.0 to 3.4
f. ☐ 3.5 to 3.9
g. ☐ 4.0 to 4.4
h. ☐ 4.5 to 4.9
i. ☐ 5.0 or more

22. Below rate the quantity and quality of your administrative staff. (Circle one)

a. The amount (quantity) of administrative assistance is:

1 — 2 — 3 — 4 — 5

Inadequate — Fully adequate

b. The quality of administrative assistance is:

1 — 2 — 3 — 4 — 5

Inadequate — Fully adequate

23. What percentage of the students in your 1976-77 graduating class are going on to college?

a. ☐ Less than 5%
b. ☐ 5% to 9%
c. ☐ 10% to 19%
d. ☐ 20% to 29%
e. ☐ 30% to 39%
f. ☐ 40% to 59%
g. ☐ 60% to 79%
h. ☐ 80% to 94%
i. ☐ 95% or more

24. What percentage of all pupils who enter the first year of high school at your school drop out before graduation? Do not include those who transfer to another school.

a. ☐ None
b. ☐ Less than 10%
c. ☐ 10% to 24%
d. ☐ 25% to 35%
e. ☐ 36% or more

25. What do you estimate to be the percent of average daily attendance of those enrolled in your school during the 1976-77 school year?

a. ☐ Less than 50%
b. ☐ 50% to 60%
c. ☐ 60% to 70%
d. ☐ 70% to 80%
e. ☐ 80% to 90%
f. ☐ 90% to 95%
g. ☐ 95% or more

26. What level of education is most representative of teachers new to your school within the past five years?

a. ☐ Less than 4-year degree
b. ☐ Bachelor's degree
c. ☐ Master's degree
d. ☐ Master's degree plus additional graduate hours
e. ☐ Doctor of Education or Ph.D.

27. How many full-time teachers will be newly employed at your school beginning fall 1977? Do not include teachers already serving in your district who will transfer to your school.

a. ☐ None
b. ☐ One
c. ☐ Two
d. ☐ Three
e. ☐ Four
f. ☐ Five
g. ☐ More than 5

28. What proportion of your full-time teachers are men?

a. ☐ Less than 10%
b. ☐ 10% to 19%
c. ☐ 20% to 29%
d. ☐ 30% to 39%
e. ☐ 40% to 49%
f. ☐ 50% to 59%
g. ☐ 60% to 69%
h. ☐ 70% to 79%
i. ☐ 80% or more

29. Check below your estimate of the percentage of the total enrollment of your school participating in the following types of community or alternative programs:

	0-5%	6-10%	11-15%	More than 15%
a. Job experience programs (work/study)	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Separate vocational education center	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Community service, for credit	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Released time, for work without credit	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. "Alternative school" within this school	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. "Alternative school" not in this school	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Released time for religious instruction	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Other, specify _____	☐	☐	☐	☐

30. Check below the types of experience for which students in your school earn credit toward graduation:

a. ☐ Night, adult school, or correspondence courses
b. ☐ College level courses taught at your school
c. ☐ College courses taught at a college or university
d. ☐ Credit by examination
e. ☐ Credit by contract and independent study
f. ☐ Off-campus work experience or on-the-job training
g. ☐ Community volunteer programs
h. ☐ Summer school
i. ☐ Other, specify _____

31. Check below all the federal or state programs for which your school receives funds:

a. ☐ Federal Title I (ESEA)
b. ☐ State Compensatory Education
c. ☐ Vocational Education
d. ☐ Impact Aid (SAFA)
e. ☐ Career Education
f. ☐ Special Education
g. ☐ Bilingual
h. ☐ Assistance to Indo-Chinese Refugee Children
i. ☐ Desegregation (Emergency School Aid Act)
j. ☐ Title IV (instructional)
k. ☐ Title III (innovative programs)
l. ☐ Other, specify _____

32. Below are listed several factors which could be considered as "road blocks" preventing principals from doing the job they would like to do. Using the alternatives below, indicate with a check whether each factor has or has not been a road block to you during the 1976-77 school year:

		A. Not a factor	B. Somewhat a factor	C. Serious factor
a.	Lack of time (for myself)	☐	☐	☐
b.	Lack of district-wide flexibility (each school must conform to a single policy)	☐	☐	☐
c.	Inability to provide teacher time for planning and other professional improvement activities	☐	☐	☐
d.	Long standing traditions in a relatively old school	☐	☐	☐
e.	Inability to obtain funds	☐	☐	☐
f.	Teacher tenure	☐	☐	☐
g.	Superintendent, or central staff who have not measured up to your expectations	☐	☐	☐
h.	Variations in the ability and dedication of teachers	☐	☐	☐
i.	Tendency of older teachers to frown on new methods	☐	☐	☐
j.	Compulsory school attendance laws	☐	☐	☐
k.	Insufficient space and physical facilities	☐	☐	☐
l.	Time taken up by administrative detail (at the expense of more important matters)	☐	☐	☐
m.	Defective communication among various administrative levels	☐	☐	☐
n.	Problem students (apathetic, hostile, etc.)	☐	☐	☐
o.	Lack of competent office help	☐	☐	☐
p.	Too large a student body	☐	☐	☐
q.	Collective bargaining agreement	☐	☐	☐
r.	Parents apathetic or irresponsible about their own children	☐	☐	☐

33. Below are listed several kinds of individuals or groups external to the school, which may have sought, successfully or unsuccessfully, to bring about particular changes in your school. Check the extent of influence of each interest group on your school during the past two years:

	1 No Influence	2 Little Influence	3 Moderate Influence	4 Great deal of Influence
a. Athletic-minded persons (especially alumni)	□	□	□	□
b. Extreme right-wing individuals or groups	□	□	□	□
c. Extreme left-wing individuals or groups	□	□	□	□
d. Individuals or groups seeking to censor books	□	□	□	□
e. State legislature investigating committees	□	□	□	□
f. State college and/or universities	□	□	□	□
g. Automobile associations, insurance companies, etc., concerning driver education	□	□	□	□
h. Individuals, groups concerned about testing programs	□	□	□	□
i. Individuals, groups concerned about implementation of various recommendations of national reports, studies, etc.	□	□	□	□
j. Religious or church groups	□	□	□	□
k. Local newspapers and other media editorial policy	□	□	□	□
l. That element of the business community which employs students or graduates	□	□	□	□
m. Other elements in the business community	□	□	□	□
n. Local labor organizations	□	□	□	□
o. Citizen or parent groups (other than PTA)	□	□	□	□
p. Women's rights or minority group organizations	□	□	□	□
q. Legal aid groups	□	□	□	□
r. State teachers' organizations	□	□	□	□

Respond to the next five questions as they pertain to your job as in your judgment (A) it actually is, and (B) how you think it should be:

34. A. How much job security do you have as a principal? Circle one number.

1	2	3	4	5
Little		Moderate		Very secure

B. How much job security should you have as principal?

1	2	3	4	5
Little		Moderate		Very secure

35. A. How much opportunity to be helpful to other people does your position as principal provide? Circle one number.

1	2	3	4	5
Little		Moderate		Considerable

B. How much opportunity to be helpful to other people should your position as principal provide?

1	2	3	4	5
Little		Moderate		Considerable

36. A. How much prestige does your position as a principal give you in the community where your school is located? Circle one number.

1	2	3	4	5
Little		Moderate		Considerable

B. How much prestige should your position as principal give you in the community where your school is located?

1	2	3	4	5
Little		Moderate		Considerable

37. A. How much opportunity for independent thought and action does your position as a principal provide? Circle one number.

1	2	3	4	5
Little		Moderate		Considerable

B. How much opportunity for independent thought and action should your position as principal provide?

1	2	3	4	5
Little		Moderate		Considerable

38. A. How much self-fulfillment (that is the feeling of being able to use one's unique capabilities, or realizing one's potential) does your position as principal provide? Circle one number.

1	2	3	4	5
Little		Moderate		Considerable

B. How much self-fulfillment should your position as principal provide?

1	2	3	4	5
Little		Moderate		Considerable

39. Listed below are courses which may be taught in schools of education. Indicate with a check in the appropriate column your judgment about the necessity of each for a beginning high school principal.

	1 Of No Use	2 Somewhat Useful	3 Highly Useful Not Essential	4 Essential
a. Administrative theory	□	□	□	□
b. Child and adolescent development	□	□	□	□
c. Community relations	□	□	□	□
d. Comparative education	□	□	□	□
e. Counseling and guidance theory and practice	□	□	□	□
f. Curriculum and program development	□	□	□	□
g. History of education	□	□	□	□
h. Human relations	□	□	□	□
i. Internship and field experience	□	□	□	□
j. Leadership	□	□	□	□
k. Negotiations	□	□	□	□
l. Personnel administration	□	□	□	□
m. Philosophy of education	□	□	□	□
n. Political science and politics of education	□	□	□	□
o. Psychology of learning	□	□	□	□
p. Research methodology	□	□	□	□
q. Secondary school principalship	□	□	□	□
r. School finance and budgeting	□	□	□	□
s. School law	□	□	□	□
t. School management	□	□	□	□
u. Social and economic context of contemporary education	□	□	□	□
v. Supervision of instruction	□	□	□	□
w. Tests and measurement	□	□	□	□
x. Vocational education	□	□	□	□
y. Other, specify _____	□	□	□	□

_____

40. Much has been said and written recently about the tasks of American schools. Rank the 11 statements below according to your beliefs about their relative importance as educational purposes. Assign a rank of 1 to the statement you consider most important, a rank of 2 to the task you consider to be of second importance, etc., until you assign a rank of 11 to the statement you consider least important.

TASK	RANK
a. Acquisition of basic skills (e.g., reading, writing, computing)	____
b. Appreciation for and experience with the fine arts	____
c. Career planning and training in specific "entry level" occupational skills	____
d. Development of moral and spiritual values	____
e. Development of positive self-concept and good human relations	____
f. Development of skills and practice of critical intellectual inquiry and problem solving	____
g. Development of the skills to operate a technological society (engineering, scientific)	____
h. Knowledge about and skills in preparation for family life (e.g., sex education, home management, problems of aging, etc.)	____
i. Preparation for a changing world	____
j. Physical fitness and useful leisure time sports	____
k. Understanding of the American value system (its political, economic, social values, etc.)	____

41. Your reactions are sought regarding broad educational issues which affect high schools across the country. Check below the column after each statement which most closely reflects your view:

	1. Agree Without Reservation	2. Agree With Some Reservations	3. Agree With Many Reservations	4. Do Not Agree
a. The principle of universal secondary education is essential to American society.	□	□	□	□
b. Federal aid must be made available to private and religious secondary schools.	□	□	□	□
c. Court decisions concerning compulsory prayer and Bible reading are correct as they apply to public schools.	□	□	□	□
d. Court decisions concerning racial segregation are correct as they apply to public schools.	□	□	□	□
e. Certain limitations should be placed upon classroom discussions of political "isms" and "anti-isms."	□	□	□	□

41. *continued*

	1. Agree Without Reservation	2. Agree With Some Reservations	3. Agree With Many Reservations	4. Do Not Agree
f. Schools require far too little academic work of students. Note: Base your response to this item only with reference to the school of which you are now principal.	□	□	□	□
g. The U.S. is not producing enough doctors and research scholars in fields of human needs such as energy, environment, etc.	□	□	□	□
h. The U.S. is not producing enough skilled technicians and "middle" level technical/ managerial people.	□	□	□	□
i. There is a need to justify as practical each subject taught in secondary schools.	□	□	□	□
j. Grouping according to IQ or achievement scores is desirable in academic subjects such as math, English and foreign languages.	□	□	□	□
k. The academic year (compulsory) should be lengthened.	□	□	□	□
l. Youths who are disinterested or hostile toward schooling should not be required to attend.	□	□	□	□
m. School attendance should be compulsory until high school graduation, or age 18.	□	□	□	□
n. Schools should provide a general intellectual background and leave specific job training to other agencies.	□	□	□	□
o. High schools should develop special programs for educating the academically talented students.	□	□	□	□
p. High schools should design special programs for the handicapped, ethnic minority, and non-English speaking.	□	□	□	□
q. Equal treatment of the sexes, as embodied in Title IX guidelines, is a positive development in secondary schools.	□	□	□	□
r. Student rights in matters of due process, as being interpreted by the courts, is a necessary development in secondary schools.	□	□	□	□
s. Legislation and court decisions regarding confidentiality of records of students and staff is a necessary development in secondary schools.	□	□	□	□
t. High schools should not undertake major curriculum changes without first securing community support.	□	□	□	□

42. All things considered (learning conditions, teaching staff, capital outlay, etc.), what is your judgment about the optimum number of students for a comprehensive high school.

a. ☐ Less than 500
b. ☐ 500 to 999
c. ☐ 1,000 to 1,499
d. ☐ 1,500 to 1,999
e. ☐ 2,000 to 2,499
f. ☐ 2,500 to 2,999
g. ☐ 3,000 to 3,499
h. ☐ above 3,500

43. In your opinion, if school classes are maintained at about their present size, do technological advances, such as teaching by TV, computer assisted instruction, etc., hold real promise for improving the quality of education in secondary schools?

a. ☐ Yes, considerable promise
b. ☐ Yes, some promise
c. ☐ No, little if any promise
d. ☐ No, would be definitely harmful
e. ☐ No opinion

44. Would you be in favor of some system of individualized promotion for students rather than the customary use of grade placement and continuous promotion?

a. ☐ Yes
b. ☐ Yes, we have such a system
c. ☐ Some advantages, some disadvantages
d. ☐ No
e. ☐ No opinion

45. Are you in favor of some rigorous check of attainment of basic skills (e.g., competency testing) for graduation?

a. ☐ Yes
b. ☐ Yes, we have such a system
c. ☐ Some advantages, some disadvantages
d. ☐ No
e. ☐ No opinion

46. Do you favor the idea of a "multiple-diploma" or "diploma and certificate" plan for students who have failed to achieve a minimum mastery of certain basic subjects?

a. ☐ Yes
b. ☐ Yes, we have such a system
c. ☐ Some advantages, some disadvantages
d. ☐ No
e. ☐ No opinion

47. What is your opinion about the usefulness of educational research?

a. ☐ Such research is highly useful
b. ☐ Such research is usually useful
c. ☐ Such research is occasionally useful
d. ☐ Such research is not useful
e. ☐ No opinion

48. If you could choose again, would you select educational administration as a career?

a. ☐ Yes, definitely
b. ☐ Yes, probably
c. ☐ Uncertain
d. ☐ No, probably not
e. ☐ No, definitely not

49. Do you hope to move eventually to another position in the profession of education?

a. ☐ Yes, to a principalship in a larger district
b. ☐ Yes, to a principalship in a smaller district
c. ☐ Yes, to teaching or counseling
d. ☐ Yes, to a superintendency or central office position
e. ☐ Yes, to a junior college position
f. ☐ Yes, to a college or university position
g. ☐ Yes to some other position, specify _____
h. ☐ I am undecided
i. ☐ No

50. Concern has been expressed that principals, in general, are not accorded the professional status and prestige to which they are properly entitled by virtue of education, training, and the work they do:

A. Is this a problem?
a. ☐ Yes, it is a serious problem
b. ☐ Yes, it occurs but is not a serious problem.
c. ☐ No, it is not a serious problem

B. Do you feel that NASSP should take additional steps to help insure that its members are accorded appropriate professional status?

a. ☐ Yes b. ☐ No c. ☐ No opinion

51. Which individuals or groups are involved (i.e., participate, contribute to discussion) in decision making in your school? For each type of decision place a 1 in the cell corresponding to those who participate in deliberation about decision; place a 2 in the cell corresponding to those who generate recommendations, etc.; and place a 3 in the cell corresponding to those who participate in the final decision.

	Central office administration	Assistant principal(s) or equivalent	Department chairperson(s)	Teachers (individuals; committees; or faculty as a whole)	Students; Elected or appointed group	Parent and community groups
a. Adding a new course or instructional program						
b. Adopting rules for student behavior						
c. Evaluating the school's grading practices						
d. Formulating school goals						
e. Developing a budget for your school						

52. To what extent do you have authority to approve the allocation of discretionary funds within your school budget?

a. ☐ Unrestricted authority
b. ☐ Authority with some restriction
c. ☐ Little authority
d. ☐ No authority

53. How much authority do you have to make the choice between hiring one full time teacher or some alternative such as hiring two teacher aides?

a. ☐ Unrestricted authority
b. ☐ Authority with some restriction
c. ☐ Little authority
d. ☐ No authority

54. Do you participate in determining the budget allocation for your school?

a. ☐ High participation
b. ☐ Moderate participation
c. ☐ Little participation
d. ☐ No participation

55. How much authority do you have to fill teacher vacancies? Select only one.

a. ☐ I make the selection and the central office endorses it.
b. ☐ I make a selection within limited options given by the central office.
c. ☐ The central office selects the teacher to fill the vacancy.

56. Several factors may constrain your ability to carry out your responsibilities as principal. Furthermore, the source of these constraints may be on the federal, state, or local level, or they may originate within the school itself. Circle one number on each line below to indicate your estimate of the constraint attached to each factor.

	Not a Constraint	Minor Constraint	Major Constraint
A. Compliance with federal regulations concerning:			
a. Desegration/busing	1	2	3
b. Title IX	1	2	3
c. Student rights (due process)	1	2	3
d. Categorical funds (Title I, etc., programs)	1	2	3
e. Other, describe _____	1	2	3
B. Compliance with state requirements concerning:			
a. Compulsory attendance	1	2	3
b. Graduation requirements	1	2	3
c. Curriculum and textbooks	1	2	3
d. Accountability	1	2	3
e. Categorical funds (i.e., special ed.)	1	2	3
f. Other, describe _____	1	2	3
C. Central office/school board factors			
a. Policy restrictions	1	2	3
b. Lack of support	1	2	3
c. Interference	1	2	3
d. Other, describe _____	1	2	3
D. Community factors			
a. Pressures of special interest groups	1	2	3
b. Parents' lack of interest	1	2	3
c. Parental demands	1	2	3
d. Other, describe _____	1	2	3
E. Within school factors			
Students			
a. Absenteeism	1	2	3
b. Lack of motivation	1	2	3
c. Discipline problems	1	2	3
Teachers			
a. Contract specifications	1	2	3
b. Unprofessionalism (incompetency, uncooperativeness, lack of motivation)	1	2	3
c. Other, describe _____	1	2	3

57. How do you spend your time during the typical work week? Rank these nine areas according to the amounts of time spent in each area. (#1 signifies greatest amount of time, #9 signifies the least amount of time.) First make your rankings of Column A (Do spend time), then make your rankings of Column B (Should spend time).

A. DO Spend Time	Area of Responsibility	B. SHOULD Spend Time
_____	Program Development (curriculum, instructional leadership)	_____
_____	Personnel (evaluation, advising, conferencing, recruiting)	_____
_____	School Management (weekly calendar, office, budget, correspondence, memos, etc.)	_____
_____	Student Activities (meetings, supervision, planning)	_____
_____	Student Behavior (discipline, attendance, meetings)	_____
_____	Community (PTA, advisory groups, parent conferences)	_____
_____	District Office (meetings, task forces, reports, etc.)	_____
_____	Professional Development (reading, conferences, etc.)	_____
_____	Planning (annual, long range)	_____

58. Do you teach in your school other than substituting?

a. ☐ Yes, more than half time
b. ☐ Yes, less than half time but regularly
c. ☐ Yes, incidentally by choice
d. ☐ No

59. What is the basis of your salary determination?

a. ☐ Tied to a percentage of a step in the teacher salary schedule
b. ☐ My level in the teacher salary schedule plus an increment for administration
c. ☐ Separate negotiations of an administrative bargaining unit
d. ☐ Independently arrived at by board decision
e. ☐ Negotiated on an individual basis
f. ☐ Established administrative schedule
g. ☐ Does not apply (religious order)

60. Identify the professional activities in which you have participated during the past school year:

Activities	Check if Participated
a. National meeting of NASSP	☐
b. National meetings of other educational organizations	☐
c. State meetings of principals' associations	☐
d. State meetings of other educational organizations	☐
e. Studies through formal courses and workshops for credit	☐
f. Travel for visitation outside of the district	☐
g. Involvement in formal project or research in education	☐
h. Participated in conference and workshops, not included above and outside of the district	☐
i. Participated in conference and workshops within district	☐
j. Participated in a study group on a planned, regular basis not included above	☐
k. Other type of professional growth activity, specify _____	☐

61. Consider the following list of nationally circulated periodicals:

Rank in Column A the periodicals you have most regularly read during the past school year. Begin with 1 for the periodical most read and continue ranking all periodicals regularly read:

In Column B, rank the periodicals you have checked in Column A in order of importance to you. Begin with 1 for the periodical of greatest use to you:

	A	B
Administrator's Science Quarterly		
Education Digest		
Educational Leadership		
Education USA		
Harvard Educational Review		
Momentuna/Today's Catholic Teacher		
NASSP Bulletin		
National Elementary Principal		
Regional Accreditation Association Quarterlies		
Phi Delta Kappan		
Saturday Review		
Teacher College Record		

62. Three types of issues are presented below. For each issue indicate with a check whether during the past school year an individual represented by the category described has requested your opinion or asked for information concerning the issue indicated.

A. Issues involving federal legislation or federal court decisions.

a. ☐ No one has requested my opinion or information about such issues.
b. ☐ Teachers have requested my opinion or information about such issues.
c. ☐ Other principals and building administrators have requested my opinion or information about such issues.
d. ☐ Superintendent or central office staff have requested my opinion or information about such issues.
e. ☐ Community leaders, including school board members, have requested my opinion or information about such issues.
f. ☐ Parents have requested my opinion or information about such issues.
g. ☐ Students have requested my opinion or information about such issues.

B. Issues involving educational accountability of teachers and/or administrators or student competency testing district wide.

a. ☐ No one has requested my opinion or information about such issues.
b. ☐ Teachers have requested my opinion or information about such issues.
c. ☐ Other principals and building administrators have requested my opinion or information about such issues.
d. ☐ Superintendent or central office staff have requested my opinion or information about such issues.
e. ☐ Community leaders, including school board members, have requested my opinion or information about such issues.
f. ☐ Parents have requested my opinion or information about such issues.
g. ☐ Students have requested my opinion or information about such issues.

C. Issues involving improvement of basic skills in your school.

a. ☐ No one has requested my opinion or information about such issues.
b. ☐ Teachers have requested my opinion or information about such issues.
c. ☐ Other principals and building administrators have requested my opinion or information about such issues.
d. ☐ Superintendent or central office staff have requested my opinion or information about such issues.
e. ☐ Community leaders, including school board members, have requested my opinion or information about such issues.
f. ☐ Parents have requested my opinion or information about such issues.
g. ☐ Students have requested my opinion or information about such issues.

63. Following are reports which have received national circulation during the past three or four years. Check each item which you have read (column I) and have used (column II) in your school:

A.	I. Read	II. Used		
	☐	☐	a.	New Roles for Youth in the School and Community, Report of National Commission on Resources for Youth
	☐	☐	b.	RISE, Report of California Commission for Reform of Intermediate and Secondary Education
	☐	☐	c.	Secondary Schools in a Changing Society: This We Believe, NASSP Task Force
	☐	☐	d.	The Adolescent, Other Citizens, and Their High Schools, Task Force '74
	☐	☐	e.	The Education of Adolescents, Report of National Panel on High Schools and Adolescent Education, HEW
	☐	☐	f.	The Reform of Secondary Education, Report of National Commission, Kettering Foundation
	☐	☐	g.	To Teach as Jesus Did, National Conference of Catholic Bishops
	☐	☐	h.	Vitalizing the High School, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
	☐	☐	i.	Youth: Transition to Adulthood, President's Advisory Panel on Youth

B. Check below the specific ways in which you have used the reports noted above:

a. ☐ Used for my own knowledge, information.

b. ☐ Circulated to the entire faculty.

c. ☐ Called attention of the faculty to the report by announcement, bulletin item, etc.

d. ☐ Circulated to specific faculty members.

e. ☐ Used in inservice, such as faculty meeting.

f. ☐ Used as resource with curriculum committee, graduation requirements committee, etc.

g. ☐ Discussed specifically with groups such as department chairmen.

h. ☐ Other, specify _____

64. The following questions deal with ways in which parents or other citizens may have been involved during the past year in the affairs of your school:

A. Check below the areas in which you involve parents or other citizens in a planning-advisory capacity in your school.

a. ☐ Objectives and priorities for the school
b. ☐ Program changes and new programs being considered
c. ☐ Student activities
d. ☐ Student behavior, rights and responsibilities
e. ☐ Finance and fund raising
f. ☐ Evaluation of programs
g. ☐ Evaluation of personnel
h. ☐ General administration
i. ☐ Other, specify _____

B. Check below the areas in which you involve parents or other citizens in the operation of the school.

a. ☐ Aides (volunteer)
b. ☐ Resource persons to programs and activities, including instructing
c. ☐ Sponsors or advisors of student groups
d. ☐ Monitors, supervisors, ticket sellers, etc., of student activities
e. ☐ Tutors (volunteer)
f. ☐ Advisors, counselors to individual students
g. ☐ Operators of concessions, etc., for the benefit of the school.
h. ☐ Other, specify _____

65. In your opinion what is occurring in regard to desire of parents/citizen and students to participate in your school? Use the past school year as the basis of your opinion:

A. Parent/citizen participation

a. ☐ Parents are becoming more willing to participate.
b. ☐ Parents are becoming less willing to participate.
c. ☐ Parent willingness to participate remains about the same as it has been over the past few years.
d. ☐ No opinion.

B. Student participation

a. ☐ Students are becoming more willing to participate.
b. ☐ Students are becoming less willing to participate.
c. ☐ Student willingness to participate remains about the same as it has been over the past few years.
d. ☐ No opinion.

66. Below is a list of conditions (e.g., enrollment decline) or developments (e.g., competency testing) which many believe will have general influence upon secondary education. We would like your opinion about each as you feel it will be an influence in your school during the next three to five years.

Mark the appropriate space to indicate whether the condition or development in your opinion will (1) be of no influence, (2) be of some influence, or (3) be a strong influence in your school:

Condition	1 No Influence	2 Some Influence	3 Strong Influence
a. Enrollment decline	☐	☐	☐
b. Students' nonattendance	☐	☐	☐
c. Alternative schools	☐	☐	☐
d. Demands for basics	☐	☐	☐
e. Declining achievement	☐	☐	☐
f. Lowering compulsory attendance age	☐	☐	☐
g. Community-based learning	☐	☐	☐
h. National youth service	☐	☐	☐
i. Desegregation	☐	☐	☐
j. Finance and general economy	☐	☐	☐
k. Drug use	☐	☐	☐
l. Accountability	☐	☐	☐
m. New technology	☐	☐	☐
n. Community participation	☐	☐	☐
o. Staff competency	☐	☐	☐
p. Competency testing of students	☐	☐	☐
q. Graduation requirements	☐	☐	☐
r. Other, specify _____	☐	☐	☐

NASSP BOARD OF DIRECTORS (1978–1979)

President: E. Eugene Miller, Principal, Grand Island Senior HS, Grand Island, Nebr.

President-Elect: George E. Melton, Principal, Brookens Junior HS, Urbana, Ill.

Keith J. Coates, Principal, Central HS, Rapid City, S. Dak.
Joseph A. Coccia, Principal, Cranston HS West, Cranston, R.I.
H. Richard Conover, Principal, Millburn Junior HS, Millburn, N.J.
Frank H. Elliott, Principal, Thomas Jefferson HS, Alexandria, Va.
Donald W. Hatch, Principal, South Middle School, Westfield, Mass.
Frank L. Jones, Principal, Northside HS, Fort Smith, Ark.
Donald L. Linn, Director of Accreditation, Planning, and Secondary Education, School District of Greenville County, Greenville, S.C.
Elgin A. Mallory, Principal, Roswell HS, Roswell, N.Mex.
Merrell S. McIlwain, Principal, South Charleston HS, South Charleston, W.Va.
Larry G. Olsen, Principal, Chaparral HS, Las Vegas, Nev.
J. Walter Potter, Principal, Aberdeen Senior HS, Aberdeen, Md.
Forest C. Scott, Principal, Andrews Middle School, Andrews, Tex.
William C. Scott, Assistant Principal, Bel Air Middle School, Bel Air, Md.
Bert Simmons, Principal, North Eugene HS, Eugene, Oreg.
J. Howard Straiton, Principal on Special Assignment, Washburn HS, Minneapolis, Minn.
Gilbert R. Weldy, Principal, Niles North HS, Skokie, Ill.

THE END